Annaeana Tragica

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF SENECA'S TRAGEDIES

BY

JOHN G. FITCH

BRILL MNEMOSYNE · SUPPLEMENTA

ANNAEANA TRAGICA

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER • H.S. VERSNEL

D.M. SCHENKEVELD • P.H. SCHRIJVERS

S.R. SLINGS†

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

H. PINKSTER, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM QUINQUAGESIMUM SEXTUM

JOHN G. FITCH

ANNAEANA TRAGICA

TUTA SUB AEGIDE PALLAS · 1683 ·

ANNAEANA TRAGICA

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF SENECA'S TRAGEDIES

BY

JOHN G. FITCH

BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON
2004

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Fitch, John G.
Annaeana tragica : notes on the text of Seneca's tragedies / by John G. Fitch.
p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958 ; 256)
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and indexes.
ISBN 90-04-14003-4
1. Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, ca. 4 B.C.-65 A.D.—Tragedies. 2. Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, ca. 4 B.C.-65 A.D.—Criticism, Textual. 3. Mythology, Classical, in literature. 4. Tragedy. I. Title. II. Series.

PA6685.F37 2004
872'.01—dc22

2004050067

ISSN 0169-8958
ISBN 90 04 14003 4

© Copyright 2004 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Abbreviations vii

Introduction 1
Hercules 5
Troades 33
Phoenissae 65
Medea 79
Phaedra 103
Oedipus 135
Agamemnon 155
Thyestes 177
[Seneca], *Hercules Oetaeus* 191
[Seneca], *Octavia* 233

Appendix: The Colometry of the Anapaests 263
Bibliography of Works Cited 279
Index of Latin Words 285
General Index 289

This page intentionally left blank

ABBREVIATIONS

Bill.	Billerbeck's edition of *Hercules*
KK	Zwierlein, *Kritischer Kommentar*
Korr.	Axelson, *Korruptelenkult*
K-S	Kühner, R., and C. Stegmann, *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre.* 5th ed. Hanover 1976
Proleg.	Zwierlein 1984 (*Prolegomena*)
Rez.	Zwierlein 1966 (*Rezitationsdramen*)
SA	Fitch 1987 (*Seneca's Anapaests*)
SSU	Billerbeck 1988 (*Sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen*)
STrag	The tragedies transmitted under Seneca's name, except *HO* and *Oct*
Zw.	Zwierlein
Ag	*Agamemnon*
Herc	*Hercules*
HO	*Hercules Oetaeus*
Med	*Medea*
Oct	*Octavia*
Oed	*Oedipus*
Pha	*Phaedra*
Phoen	*Phoenissae*
Thy	*Thyestes*
Tro	*Troades*

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

Progress in editing Seneca's tragedies has historically been linked to understanding the relative value of the two MSS traditions in which they are preserved, E and A.[1] The vast majority of surviving MSS are derived from A; consequently all early editions of the plays contain some form of this vulgate text. In the winter of 1640, however, Gronovius discovered the Etruscus (E) in Florence. He recognised that it contained a much purer version of the text, free of the deliberate interpolation characteristic of A. Gronovius' edition of 1661 consequently marked the beginning of a new age. Respect for E's readings gained ground thereafter, but was eventually taken to excess in the edition of Friedrich Leo (1878–79), who, under the influence of contemporary text-critical practice, systematically preferred the readings of this 'best codex,' even when clearly erroneous and needing correction, to those of A, even when blameless.[2] This methodological excess was, however, offset by the depth and incisiveness of Leo's scholarship, which make his *Observationes* (contained in volume 1 of the edition) still invaluable for critics of the tragedies.

In the twentieth century the fortunes of the A tradition rose once more. In the course of assessing more than 300 MSS known to him, Stuart (1912) uncovered three, referred to as P, C and S, which transmit the A text without contamination from E. Much later MacGregor (1978), who knew some 400 MSS, uncovered T, a close relative of P which is free of P's numerous idiosyncratic errors. The readings of A can almost always be reconstructed from the evidence of these four MSS. A reaction also set in against Leo's overvaluation of E. Largely through the publications of Gunnar Carlsson (1926, 1929, 1948) it became clear that A, despite its interpolated character, does sometimes preserve correct readings at points where E has gone wrong through mechanical corruption or through deliberate

---

[1] Detailed studies of the transmission and the relationship between E and A will be found in Tarrant's *Agamemnon* pp. 23–87 and Zwierlein's *Prolegomena* pp. 7–181; briefer accounts are available in many of the recent editions of individual plays.

[2] For examples see my index under 'E (Etruscus).'

alteration (which in E is usually naive and unskilful). In principle, then, an editor must weigh the variant readings of E and A with an open mind. In practice, however, the presence of systematic interpolation in A makes it difficult to distinguish those places where it preserves a correct reading. We still need a detailed typological analysis of A's interpolations, which would enable us to understand what kinds of interpolation A does and does not make.[3]

Progress in criticism of the text has also depended on the indispensable task of collecting parallel and illustrative material from ancient literature; here one would name particularly Delrius in the sixteenth century, Gronovius in the seventeenth and Pierrot in the nineteenth.[4] Emendation has also played an important role, especially as practiced by the masters of conjecture, N. Heinsius and Bentley.[5] More recently Axelson has contributed many persuasive conjectures, notably in *HO* and in *Phaedra*.[6]

Among twentieth-century critics of Seneca's text, Otto Zwierlein demands special mention. He has devoted much of his academic career to this subject, from an appendix to his thesis, through a series of articles, to publication of the *Prolegomena*, the Oxford Classical Text and the invaluable *Kritischer Kommentar* (details in Bibliography). His long familiarity with the text has enabled him to identify points of corruption, and to correct several of them persuasively.[7] Moreover his diligent study of ancient literature, of modern scholarship and of technical matters such as metre and elision has enabled him to solve

---

[3] Such an analysis would be particularly helpful in *Octavia*, where we do not have the testimony of E to identify places where A interpolation may have occurred. The beginnings of such a typology are found in Tarrant's *Agamemnon* p. 62 and Zwierlein's *Proleg.* pp. 42–43; see also the indices of *KK* under 'Interpolationen,' pp. 504–05.

[4] J. Pierrot was responsible for vol. 1 of the *editio Lemairiana*, containing *Herc, Thy* and *Phoen*. Because vols. 2 and 3, prepared by a "studiosa professorum societas," were of mediocre quality, the value of Pierrot's work has often been overlooked.

[5] Bentley's conjectures took the form of marginal jottings in his copy of Gronovius' edition: consequently they lack explanation and supportive evidence. Even after publication by Hedicke (1899), they were not properly valued until Tarrant and Zwierlein gave them recognition.

[6] For *HO* see Axelson 1967. Axelson's judgments and conjectures in the rest of the corpus were communicated to Zwierlein, and are reported in *KK*.

[7] I have accepted his deletion of *Tro* 1143^a–44^b, 1147, *Med* 242–43, 477, *Oed* 636–37; his recognition of lacunae at *Pha* 1145, *Oed* 174, *Ag* 819, *HO* 844, 1650, *Oct* 414; his transposition of *Herc* 146–51, 587, *HO* 655–56, 866, 1407; his conjectures at *Herc* 280, *Oed* 824, *Ag* 471, *HO* 327, 1814.

conclusively a substantial number of long-standing problems. Consequently his *KK* is now the natural starting-point for any serious consideration of the text. The present work should be seen as a supplement and complement to *KK*. My notes are intended to be read in conjunction with Zw.'s, not in place of them: points made by Zw., and references given by him, are usually not repeated here. Where Zwierlein and recent editors agree and I concur with their judgment, I have not usually felt it necessary to add anything to their discussions.

Inevitably the assessment of Zwierlein's work cannot be exclusively favourable. Any editor has foibles and flaws in judgment which need to be taken into account by others. In Zwierlein's case they include a tendency to rely on parallels *per se*, rather than weighing their significance; mistrust of rare or unique words and phrases, and preference for the normative; and a tendency to judge the text by the criteria of rational utterance, rather than those of impassioned, tendentious rhetoric.[8] He is also too generously hospitable to conjectural alterations of the text whose justification has not been fully established.[9] But these flaws, once recognised, can be allowed for, and do not lessen the indispensability of the *Kommentar*.[10]

In recent years there has been a profusion of scholarship on Seneca's text, stimulated to no small extent by Zwierlein's publications. It includes review articles (Delz 1989, Fitch 1985 and 1989), collections of emendations and discussions (e.g. Courtney 1985, Hudson-Williams 1989 and 1991, Watt 1989 and 1996, Fitch 2002 and 2004), discussions of individual passages (many listed in the Bibliography), textual discussions within linguistic studies (Billerbeck 1988, Kershaw 1994) and literary studies (Walde 1992), and a typology of ancient interpolation (Tarrant 1989). In addition there has been a welcome

---

[8] For examples see my review article (Fitch 1989) and the index of this volume under 'text criticism.' Timpanaro 2000 149 notes further that when invoking paleographical explanation of corruption, Zw. tends to rely on confusion of single letters (sometimes several together), rather than confusion of whole words.

[9] This is the unanimous verdict of later editors, to judge by their practice. E.g. in *Tro* the paradosis is rightly retained by Fantham, Boyle and Keulen at 120, 176f. (deleted by Zw.), 246, 273, 296, 338, 586, 1080.

[10] They do, however, mean that Zw.'s Oxford text cannot be regarded as standard in the sense of commanding widespread assent to its choice of readings. A more minor blemish of his text is caused by excessive respect for the MSS' vagaries of spelling, which results in such oddities as *aut omnis . . . defende . . . aut omnes trahe* (*Herc* 306f.) and *Priamique natam Pelei gnato ferum/mactare credis* (*Tro* 247).

spate of editions with commentary of individual plays, its *fons et origo* being Tarrant's magisterial *Agamemnon* (1976); several of these, though not all, have made substantial contributions to the assessment of textual problems.

When I undertook to prepare an edition for the Loeb Classical Library, it was clear to me that the Latin text would need to be newly constituted, to take account of so much recent scholarship. In this process it soon became apparent that for many problems the conclusive argument or evidence had not yet been found, and that much investigation remained to be undertaken. I believe that I have been able to provide new arguments or evidence at many points, and that they are often conclusive, though that is for others to judge. In retrospect I see that my textual choices, taken as a whole, steer a *media via* between the adventurousness of Zwierlein and the conservatism of Giardina. This *media via* was not, however, the result of a predetermined policy, but simply the outcome of judging each problem in turn by the best light available.

Since this introduction began with the issue of progress, it is appropriate to end by celebrating the progress that has been made on the text of these tragedies in recent years, while acknowledging how this progress is indebted to the cumulative work of earlier generations. *Octavia* will serve as an example. Of 58 passages of that play discussed by Zwierlein in his *Kommentar*, 28 seemed to me so definitely settled (for the most part by Zwierlein himself or by Ferri) that no further discussion was necessary. In turn of 56 passages which I do discuss, I regard some 23 as now solved, or solved in some aspect, by the several efforts of Zwierlein, Ferri, myself and other critics.[11] These figures represent a substantial amount of progress. But clearly much remains to be done.[12]

---

[11] They are: 174, 195, 232 (*infest-*), 261, 294ff., 388, 415 (lacuna), 458 (*metuant* corrupt), 501 (*altos* correct), 553, 577, 600, 607, 631, 691, 744, 747 (*intra* correct), 779, 789, 811, 889, 890, 958. Readers may feel that certain items should be removed from this list, but may also feel that others should be added.

[12] It would be a great aid to progress if a scholar or group of scholars were to prepare a repertory of conjectures and discussions on individual passages. The only such repertory known to me is that of Coffey 1957 for the years 1922–55. It would also be helpful to have a study of intrusive glosses, which would check the transmitted readings systematically for evidence of such intrusions, and use comparative material from the transmissions of other texts. This phenomenon seems to me more frequent in STrag than has previously been recognised (see index under 'glosses'). A third desideratum, as noted earlier, is a systematic study of interpolations in A.

HERCULES

N.B. The following notes are intended be read in conjunction with my earlier commentary on this play; I have tried, so far as possible, to avoid repeating here points made in the commentary.

Herc 20

The line is missing in A; E preserves it in the unmetrical form *Thebana tellus nuribus sparsa impiis*. The reasons for my conjectural replacement of *sparsa* with *aspersa*, which mends the metre with minimal change to the text, are given at *AJP* 1981 66 and in my comm.[1]

Two conjectures have since been published. Axelson through Zw. proposed *Thebana tellus matribus sparsa impiis*, which he intended in the sense "stained with blood by an impious mother," viz. Agave (with *matribus* as a generalising plural).[2] Critics have rightly found this ellipse of *cruore* difficult (Hudson-Williams 1989 236, Watt 1996 248, Bill. ad loc.). Further, *matribus* in this line and this passage would inevitably be understood as referring to the mothers of Jupiter's bastards, not to Pentheus' mother. Consequently at 1989 246 I suggested that the words of Axelson's conjecture would more naturally carry the sense, "scattered with ungodly mothers." These "mothers" would be women made so by Jupiter (Alcmene, Semele, Antiope), called *impiae* by Juno for their flouting of her (as she sees it). This forceful use of "mothers" would be characteristic of Sen.'s pointed style, and could well have given rise to *nuribus* as a gloss or intended correction. The reference to the women as "mothers" also gives special point to Juno's reference to herself as "stepmother" to their offspring (21). (Similarly Juno complains about Semele, *mater—quod vix mihi contigit—uno/de Iove vult fieri*, Ov. *Met.* 3.269f.). Though these

---

[1] A complete statement of the stylistic and metrical objections to the rearrangement found in KQ, *Thebana nuribus sparsa tellus impiis*, will be found in those places. There I also give parallels for passive forms of *aspergo* used in the sense 'strewn, scattered.'

[2] Zw. first explained *matribus . . . impiis* as referring to all the *impiae Cadmeides* (758) who attacked Pentheus (*KK*), but later as referring to Agave alone (Zw. 1987 83); subsequently he identified the latter as Axelson's intention.

women were not literally scattered through the land, but concentrated in Thebes itself, one must allow for the misrepresentation and exaggeration of Senecan rhetoric, which can speak (e.g.) of Priam as "buried beneath his whole realm," (*Tro* 30), and of Achilles as *sparsus per omne caelitum regnum* (*Tro* 345).

Watt 1996 248 writes, "I think it probable that *nuribus* is a guess which has supplanted another word ending in *-us* omitted because of homoeoteleuton. There is no reason why the omitted word should have been one (like *nuribus* or *matribus*) denoting women; I think it may well have been *caedibus*." These *impiae caedes*, Watt explains, could include those of Pentheus, Laius, Eteocles and Polynices, and the *terrigenae* (Ov. *Met.* 3.123). This conjecture gives additional significance to the otherwise vague phrase *dira ac fera* (19), but it seems less relevant to the context than either *nuribus* or *matribus*. Why should Sen. have had Juno elaborate here on the Theban tradition of familial murder? Once that question is asked, a possible answer suggests itself: the phrase could foreshadow a further *impia caedes* which will stain Thebes in the course of this play. But I am not confident that Sen. uses foreshadowing of this kind. When foreshadowing of the tragic outcome is unconscious, as it would be here, it usually takes the form of 'dramatic irony,' in which the speaker's statement can be understood, or question answered, in a sense other than that envisaged by the speaker, e.g. 306–07, 613–15, 899, 938f., *Med* 25f. (with Gronovius' comment on the last passage, quoted by Costa ad loc.).

Since the pointed use of *novercam* in 21 is the rhetorical climax of the sentence, and since *matribus* (= mothers of Jupiter's offspring) is the best preparation for it, I am inclined to accept Axelson's conjecture as reinterpreted above.

Herc 26

The context makes the traditional punctuation, with a comma at the end of the line, slightly preferable to Axelson's question-mark. As Juno has conceded the heavens to her rivals (4), so she concedes (*licet* 21) the coming elevation of Alcmene and Hercules, which seems inevitable to her at this point. The phrasing of 27–29 suggests not a campaign with an immediate and specific goal, viz. to prevent their elevation, but rather a perpetual state of war, continuing after their ascent. The hope of *preventing* Hercules's deification occurs to her only later in the prologue (121f.); for the development of her thought in this monologue, see pp. 115f. of my comm.

Herc 43

Whether A's *iussa* is read or E's *iura* is interpreted as a virtual synonym ("biddings" Miller), it seems pointless that Juno attributes the commands for the Labours to herself in 42 and in the next line to Eurystheus. But full weight needs to be given to *tyranni*. It is a theme of this play that Hercules regularly deposes tyrants, cf. 272 *saeva iusta sceptra confregit manu* with my comm. ad loc. Juno's point, then, is that it is futile to expect him to be harmed by subjection to the authority of a tyrant, since he has superior brute force (*violento*, cf. *manu* in 272). Consequently *iura* is to be read in the sense 'authority' (*OLD* s.v. 13), though clearly Eurystheus' authority is manifested in issuing the series of commands.

Herc 49

Reasons for accepting Leo's transposition of 49 after 54 are provided in my comm., and my response to Axelson's argument on the basis of *HO* 22 is given at *CP* 84 (1989) 243. In defending the transmitted line-order, Bill. and Zw. give divergent accounts of the sequence of thought. Bill. interprets 49[a] as meaning that Hercules was not satisfied to return *with Cerberus*, and 49[b] as meaning that he has disrupted the proper governance of the underworld—an accusation substantiated in Bill.'s view by 50–51. But first, the interpretation of *reverti* as "to return [with Cerberus]" is forced: the passage which Bill. cites as echoing it, *HO* 22f., actually contradicts it, since it distinguishes between Hercules' own ascent and Cerberus', *nec tantum redî,/sed trepidus atrum Cerberum vidit dies*. Second, *foedus* when qualified by *umbrarum* does not naturally refer to the governance of the underworld, but rather to the covenant by which the shades are separated from the upper world. Third, the focus of 50–51 is not on the conquest of Dis but on what Juno herself witnessed (*vidi ipsa vidi*), namely Hercules' alleged flaunting of his "spoils:" this does not well illustrate the phrase *foedus umbrarum perît*, however that phrase is taken.

KK 18 constructs the relationship between *refert* and *reverti* differently: "non tantum revertitur sed . . . refert." On this account, 49 restates and develops 48; the phrase *foedus umbrarum perît*, "which refers to the dragging-up [das Heraufschleppen] of Cerberus," is amplified in 50–51, as the OCT's punctuation shows. But 50–51 focus not on das Heraufschleppen, but on Hercules' hubris. Further, the sweeping nature of the phrase *foedus umbrarum perît* accords less well with the specific action of dragging up Cerberus than with a disruption

of the covenants of the underworld, which makes it more suitable as an introduction to 55–56.

Herc 54

Baden's conjecture *en* for *et* is adopted by Zw. and Bill. This *en* would draw attention to what Hercules *has* done, as opposed to what he is doing (*ducit* 59) or might do (*potitur* 54). Consequently the verb would need to be in the perfect tense, especially since, if *en* is read, the verb refers to the same action as *patefacta est* 55. (The tense of *iacent* 56, of course, shows the present results of that action.)[3]

With *et* retained, *retegit* is a sarcastic proposal by Juno for a complete unroofing of the underworld, extrapolating from what Hercules has done so far, just as *potitur* sarcastically extrapolates from his defeat of Dis.

Herc 83

Arguments for deletion are given in my comm. Tarrant 1989 142f. suggests that the line's origin lies in a process of "collaborative interpolation" affecting certain texts in antiquity, in which the reader "revises, expands or varies the text . . . simply because it allows for further elaboration, because it has not yet exhausted the possibilities of the material" (ibid., 137).[4]

[3] Against Baden's conjecture, Kershaw 246 writes, "*En* immediately followed by a third person verb is rare in the Senecan tragic corpus . . .; we do not find, anywhere I think, *en* followed by this person of the verb in turn followed by a direct object." But this places too rigid an emphasis on a particular word-order. In fact *en* not infrequently draws attention to an event described by a clause that includes a third-person transitive verb, *Herc* 961, 1002, 1082, *Phoen* 42, *Pha* 589, *Oed* 952, *Ag* 778.

Unfortunately Kershaw's statistics for types of words with which *en* is used (242) are vitiated by poor method. E.g. he classifies *Oed* 975 *parcite en patriae, precor* as a usage "with" *precor*, not with *parcite*. The premise that *en* emphasises a particular word, rather than a whole statement, is often questionable: e.g. at *Pha* 601 (cf. *HO* 484) *en locus ab omni liber arbitrio vacat*, what *en* emphasises is not the noun *locus* (as Kershaw classifies), but the fact that the place is free of witnesses.

[4] *KK* argues that the learned detail of the Lion's birth on the Moon is too obscure for an interpolator (followed by Bill. ad loc. and Mayer 1990 399 fn.), but Tarrant responds that the interpolator could have been motivated exactly by a desire to display *doctrina*; for this motive cf. my discussion of *Pha* 1106–07 at 2002 312. The fact that Sen. alludes to the Lion's lunar origin at *Thy* 855f. could have prompted the interpolator to look up the details.

Zw. and Bill. defend the line, seeing 79–83 as an instance of the 'polar' expression characteristic of STrag (i.e. here a reference to underworld, earth and heaven). Lines 79–82, however, are not shaped to express such a distinction between cosmic regions; contrast the explicitness of e.g. 1103ff. *aether/atri poli/imo antro*, and 1108ff. *chaos/unda/aer*. Rather it appears that the interpolator is attempting to manufacture such a 'polarity' by the insertion of line 83.

***Herc* 94**

At 1981 66f. I identified an inconsonance in this line as transmitted: the phrase *quam munit montis specus* suggests that Discord is surrounded by the rocky walls of a mountain cavern, but *oppositi* suggests rather that the barrier is on one side only. I proposed to replace either *specus* with *latus*, or *oppositi* with *impositi*. Subsequently I found that Bentley had anticipated the first of these conjectures, and had therefore perceived the problem.

Zw. 1988 336 offers an alternative solution by altering *oppositi* to *oppositu*. Now the *specus* is no longer *in* the mountain, but is blocked *by* it and so made into a prison; the *specus* itself is no doubt one of those vast hollow spaces in which the underworld abounds, e.g. 665, 718, *Tro* 520, *Med* 742, *Thy* 9, 105. Comparable uses of *oppositu* with an objective genitive include Cic. *Rep*. 1.25 *solem lunae oppositu solere deficere* (corrupted to *oppositum* in V^1), Gell. 4.5.3 *locum . . . quem sol oppositu . . . altarum aedium numquam illustraret*, Sen. *Phoen* 420 *et impia arma matris oppositu impedi*. Zw.'s conjecture cures the sense with elegant simplicity, while providing self-evident reasons for the corruption, and it may well be right.

Several details, however, speak in favour of correcting *specus* to *latus*. First, the adjective *ingens* would seem more relevant if denoting the vastness of the barrier imprisoning Discord, rather than the roominess of her prison. Second, *munit*, in view of the word's association with walls (*moenia*) and defences, would more appropriately have a barrier (*latus*) than a space (*specus*) as its subject. Third, it looks as if the line is designed to exhibit the familiar interweaving of two noun-adjective pairs (here aBbA), which is lost with *oppositu*. For *latus* of the side of a mountain cf. *Herc* 1209, *Tro* 931. If *latus* is correct, the idea of imprisonment in a mountain cave (*specus*) has intruded from line 80.

Herc 100

Reasons for preferring A's *incitae* to E's *citae* are given in my comm. In support of this choice, Mayer 1990[2] 273 cites Clausen in *AJP* 70 (1949) 311f. to the effect that *-um* often absorbs a following *in* or *in-* (to Clausen's examples add *Phoen* 320); Mayer suggests that *-em* can have the same effect, adducing Lucan 8.824 (add *HO* 1023). Of course the brevity of *in* and *in-*, especially when written , makes them vulnerable to loss in other circumstances too, e.g. *Herc* 353, 654, 779, *Phoen* 320, *Thy* 493, 624, 736.

Herc 108

Those who read *nobis* do not explain how *vobis* might have arisen in the archetype; misreading of *V* as *N* is not highly probable in majuscule, nor is there any emphasis on "you" and "yours" in the preceding lines to encourage such a misreading. But mechanical confusion of *u* with *n* is easy in minuscule, and would be encouraged by Juno's insistence in the following lines on her own need to become mad: hence the appearance, no doubt independently, of *nobis* in the lemma of Trevet, in the parent of KQ, and in T.

Herc 113

Zw. is correct, at p. 26 of his discussion in *KK*, that *precor* here cannot be addressed to the Furies or to a deity such as *Fortuna*. But that is no ground for conjecture, for *precor* is used here in a weakened or metaphorical sense like *vota* in 112. Even in the case of humans, *precor* may indicate an ardent wish rather than a formal prayer to a specific deity or a direct appeal to another person, e.g. Ov. *Met.* 12.121, Sen. *Tro* 1135. Previously Juno "prayed" that each Labour would prove fatal, since she had no influence over the outcome; now she makes the opposite "prayer," that Hercules will return safely, because she cannot enact the revenge she has conceived until he reaches home.

Herc 130

A vexed passage. I continue to believe that the best solution is to read *Ursa* in apposition to *signum*,[5] which gives, "The frigid constel-

[5] For apposition involving the name of a constellation cf. *Herc* 6f., 14 *hinc clara gemini signa Tyndaridae micant* (with my comm.), *Thy* 866 f. *ultima caeli sidera Pisces*.

lation by the lofty pole, Arcas' Bear . . ." Arcas is the Bear-Ward (*Custos Ursae*, Ov. *Fasti* 2.153), who "drives the Bear before him as if she were yoked" (*Arctophylax . . . quasi temoni [-e?] adiunctam prae se quatit Arcton*, Cic. *N.D.* 2.109). From here it is not a large step to call Ursa Major "the Bear of Arcas." If this were the sole identification of U. Major it would seem excessively Alexandrian, but there are several other pointers to her identity in 129–31. The story of Callisto and Arcas, and their transformation into constellations, is familiar from Ov. *Met.* 2.409–507. The likelihood of *Ursa* being corrupted to *Ursae* (E) after *Arcados* is self-evident.

If the genitive *Arcados Ursae* is read, i.e. "of the Arcadian Bear," it can hardly be a genitive of definition with *signum* (Ageno), in view of the intervening *septem stellis* and the fact that *signum* already has a genitive *celsi . . . poli*. Zw. and Bill. take *Arcados Ursae* as dependent rather on *septem stellis*, which gives, "The frigid sign . . . summons the light with the seven stars of the Arcadian Bear." They do not, however, justify the most difficult aspect of this interpretation, namely that the sign *is* the Bear. If correct, this would be an instance of 'disjunctiveness' (on which v. my comm. on 683), but the instances of this phenomenon cited by Housman and Shackleton Bailey involve accusatives and ablatives, not genitives.

If *Ursa* is read, *septem stellis* functions as an ablative of description, "Arcas' Bear with her seven stars." But if *Ursae* is preferred, *septem stellis* must be an instrumental ablative (so *KK*). However, the ablative absolute *verso temone* must also have an instrumental sense: the Bear/Wain summons the light "with/by the turning of its pole," or "by the fact that its pole has turned." The use of these two instrumental ablatives modifying one verb would be awkward. It would be scarcely less awkward to say that U. Major "summons the light with [the light of] her seven stars."

The only viable alternative to reading *Ursa*, therefore, is to delete 130 with Leo, regarding it as one of those interpolations designed "to identify figures alluded to rather than named" (Tarrant 1987 132). Sufficient clues would remain in 129 and 131 to identify U. Major. The same constellation is referred to allusively at *Tro* 439 *clarumque septem verterant stellae iugum.*

Herc 132

Aquis, the reading of recc., does not accord well with the picture of 133, in which the Sungod looks forth from the heights of Mt Oeta

(*Titan summa prospicit Oeta*). It introduces an unnecessary spatial consideration, by forcing us to suppose that the Sun rose from the waters somewhere *behind* Oeta, and was hidden from view until he could look over the ridge; further, his ascent from the sea to Oeta's summit seems too rapid. On the other hand, the associations of *eveho* with rising on high, which are noted in my comm., accord well both with Oeta's summit and with the transmitted reading *equis*.

Herc 140

Since the basic meaning of *carpere* with a human subject is to pluck or gather, and the basic meaning of *pabula* is fodder, I follow Gruter in accepting the natural interpretation of *pabula carpit*, viz. that the herdsman gathers fodder (as e.g. at *Med* 731 *carpit gramina* means that Medea gathers herbs). This activity, the purpose of which was to supplement the animals' own grazing by collecting leafy branches etc. to be consumed in the evening or stored for winter, is mentioned in many passages in ancient literature, of which those cited on p. 169 of my comm. represent only a selection. Mention of this activity fits the theme of hard work and hardship (*labor durus* 137) which runs through the human activities described in 137–58, as I pointed out ibid., pp. 159–60.

Hillen 1989 241f. believes that lines 139f. may be paraphrased *grex a pastore dimissus pabula carpit*, i.e. the herdsman is said to do what he lets the herd do, viz. graze the pastures.[6] There are two difficulties in this interpretation. First, it sets aside the natural meaning of the phrase in favour of a recherché meaning, and thus in effect imports an ambiguity into the text. Second, the participle *dimisso* indicates that the herd has not only been released from its fold, but has also been allowed to wander on its own, just like the animals of the following vignettes: so *TLL* 5.1.1209.32, which places this passage under the rubric *dimittere = a se mittere*. It would be odd to identify the animals' actions with the herdsman's at the very moment when *dimisso* indicates their mutual separation. The same objections stand in the way of accepting Hudson-Williams' interpretation 1989 187, followed by Bill., according to which *pabula carpit* means that the herdsman

[6] The interpretation is close to that of Farnaby, who paraphrases *dimittit gregem, qui carpat pabula*. Hillen compares Sil. 6.363–65 (*monitor*) *qui . . . temperet ictus/et remis dictet sonitum pariterque relatis/ad numerum* <u>*plaudat*</u> *resonantia caerula tonsis*.

"ranges the pastures." Since *dimisso* indicates that he is not leading his herd, the herdsman would be ranging the pastures in Wordsworthian solitude.

Herc 146–51

With Zw.'s convincing transposition of these lines after 136, Sen.'s dawn-song falls into two well-balanced halves, corresponding to the first two strophes of the source-passage in Eur. *Phaethon* (see my comm. pp. 158ff.): the first half describes the natural world, ending with the nightingale as in Eur., and the second describes the activities of humans and their herds. The phrase *testata diem* forms a good conclusion to the description of daybreak (so *KK* 37). Bill. p. 244 fn. 5, in rejecting the transposition, argues that the picture of the nightingale among her nestlings belongs associatively with the vignettes of young animals and their mothers in 141–45; but whether or not these animals belong to the *grex* of 140, the vignettes certainly take their cue from 139–40, so that the nightingale is out of place among them. On the possible cause of the dislocation of these lines see my comm. p. 479; on the dubious explanation through double columns see *CP* 84 (1989) 237 fn. 5; Bill. loc. cit.

Herc 183

Taking up some points from my comm., Timpanaro 2000 147–52 renews his earlier advocacy (1981 134–35) of the Σ reading *flatur* in place of *fertur* (A). I would respond as follows.

1. It remains the case that *flare* is not securely parallelled in the sense postulated by T. here, 'to blow along' (transitive). In the only transmitted instance cited by T. which is similar in sense, *Bell. Afr.* 52.4 *pulvis vento flatus*, editors generally accept Cornelisson's emendation *p.v. elatus*, regarded as probably correct by T. himself (p. 151).[7]
2. Even if *flatur* could carry the meaning postulated by T., I do not see how it would fit the context. Since the text does not specify what or who 'blows us along' (T. rightly construes *rapidis . . . fatis* as dative with *obvia*, not ablative), the answer must be something

[7] At Varro *LL* 6.9 *anima quae flatur*, the verb means 'is exhaled;' at Apul. *de mundo* 52.4 *meridies . . . uno austro . . . flatur*, it apparently means 'is blown upon.'

general, e.g. time or fate. In that case lines 183–84 are just a restatement in different terms of what is said in 179–82. But the contrastive *at* shows that we need a new point, and 185 *Stygias ultro quaerimus undas* shows what its gist must be, viz. that humans by their own behaviour hasten the already speedy approach of death. Hercules is then an egregious example, 186–87, since he voluntarily entered the world of death. Phaedra's Nurse uses a similar argument at *Pha* 475–78: many mortal dangers threaten humankind, but our own behaviour can also be fatal (n.b. *ultro* again).

3. I objected to the suggestion of passive helplessness in the reading *flatur*, since the point must be about humans' own behaviour, not what befalls them. T. claims that *fertur* would carry the same suggestion as *flatur* of passivity. Not necessarily so, for *feror* can denote movement without any external impulse (*OLD* s.v. *fero* 4): examples in STrag are *Herc* 636, 958, *Phoen* 11, 303, *Pha* 403. Here the meaning will be that humans by their own behaviour "move into the path" (*obvia fertur*) of death, perhaps unconsciously but certainly not passively.
4. In my comm., through reaction against the suggestion of passivity in *flatur* and through the influence of the exemplum of Hercules, I interpreted lines 183–85 to mean that humans "deliberately and willfully seek out death." Thanks to T.'s discussion, I see that this is an over-interpretation. The sense is rather that we humans, by squandering our lives in the ways specified in my commentary on 183–85, "of ourselves head towards death" (185), perhaps not deliberately but none the less surely. Hercules' descent to the underworld then exemplifies this "heading towards death" in an extreme and voluntarist form.

Herc 191

The phrase *recipit populos urna* suggests that the urn receives the masses physically, i.e. that the primary reference is to the funerary urn. Bill. takes the phrase to mean that the urn "receives the names" of the masses, but she gives no parallels for this brachylogy. She believes the function of the urn is to determine by lot the order in which people are summoned, adducing Livy 23.3.7 *nominibus in urnam coniectis citari quod primum sorte nomen excidit*, Val. Max. 6.3.4 *primum nomen urna extractum citari iussit*. But in 191 the masses *have already been summoned* (*citatos*). In addition, lines 188–90 speak of the date as already

fixed for each individual, so 191 would oddly revert to a previous step in the process. It is not clear from Bill.'s notes whether she regards the urn as fixing the date of trial in the underworld, or the date of death figured as trial.[8]

Herc 233

Jac. Gronovius conjectured *acta et* for the transmitted *acta est*, but postponement of *et* is rare in trimeters: of some 1147 uses of *et* in the genuine tragedies, only four involve postponement in trimeters, and another six in the freer word-order of the choral lyrics.[9] For auxiliary *est* omitted from the first verb and included in the second cf. *Thy* 239 *corrupta coniunx, imperi quassa est fides.*

Herc 251

Withof 47 assaults the paradosis with the vigour of his age, but not unjustifiably: "Quis tandem est, qui non, si paulisper modo aciem mentis huc convertat, statim percipiat absurditatem huius sermonis, *terrae sensere pacis auctorem terris abesse*, pro sibi abesse? Quis mortalium ita loquitur, nisi delirus" e.q.s. Much the best conjecture to have appeared is Watt's *curis*, in the sense of 'responsibilities,' for *terris* (see Watt 1989 329f.).

Herc 259

Zw. is no doubt correct to retain the third-person verb (*furit* A recte, *furet* FM) against the *furis* of recc. (wrongly attributed to E by Gronovius). A second-person verb can easily intrude in the presence of a noun (here *terra*) which could be read as vocative, e.g. 1038 *dabis* A, *Tro* 264 *facis* recc. The absence of apostrophe before and after 259 (n.b. third-person *premitur* 267) speaks in favour of *furit*; the apostrophe of Eur. *Her.* 217 and 252 is echoed at 268 rather than here. For postponement of *quis* cf. *Oed* 809 *In illa temet nemora quis casus tulit?*, *Thy* 714 *secunda deinde quem caede immolet.* Bill.'s hypothesis

---

[8] Bill.'s conflation of the urn of Hor. *Carm.* 2.3.26 with that of the underworld judges seems to me to add confusion to an already confused topic.

[9] The reasonably certain instances in trimeters are *Tro* 473, *Pha* 434, 474, *Ag* 807; in lyric, *Herc* 854, *Tro* 382, 403, *Oed* 116, 895, 912. Possible instances: *Herc* 843 (see my comm.) and *Tro* 849 in lyric; *Thy* 1008 in trimeter. Improbable: *Phoen* 137 (see below ad loc.) and *Med* 673. Cf. B. Schmidt 1865 8–10 and Zw. *Proleg.* 231–32.

of hymn-style in 259–67 depends largely on assuming an apostrophe in 259, and therefore cannot be used to support it.

***Herc* 269**

A classic instance of a rare but appropriate usage surviving in the paradosis, only to be displaced in recc. and in editions by a similar-looking word which is more familiar but less appropriate. *Ignarus* in the passive sense 'unknown' is used of people at V. *Aen.* 10.706 and Ov. *Met.* 7.404, and fits this Lycus, who is portrayed by Sen. as a *novus homo* (337–41). It is difficult to find an appropriate meaning for the intrusive *ignavus*. Zw.'s citations in *KK* show that he takes it in the sense 'of ignoble birth,' but this is not a well-parallelled meaning. Bill. ad loc. thinks it characterises Lycus as mean and vile ("gemeinen und verworfen"), but this meaning is equally difficult to parallel outside the abuse of early comedy.[10] *Ignavus* regularly means 'spiritless, cowardly,' but Sen.'s Lycus could not be described so even by his enemies (Amphitryon himself calls him *truculentus* 254): he has gained the throne by war, holds it by force, and prides himself on his *virtus* (340).

***Herc* 296**

Miller is right about the sense of *ignara*: "all ignorant of the fate in store for us." Gronovius glossed 295[b]–96[a], "Hic ad se redit, & recordata fortunae praesentis nimia priora dicta castigat." This shows that he took *ignara* to mean *immemor*, and similarly Bill. translates, "ohne an das Unglück denken, das mir droht." But the instances which *TLL* 7.272.36f. cites of *ignarus* carrying roughly the sense of *immemor* (Curt. 4.12.11, V. *Aen.* 1.198, 8.187) are doubtful in themselves, and certainly do not suggest that *ignarus* could be used of a momentary forgetting of one's circumstances. Gronovius may have been misled by the otherwise closely similar sentence *Tro* 474f. *sed mei fati memor/ tam magna timeo vota*, which he quotes in the same note.

[10] The only clear use of ignoble birth among the citations of the dictionaries is Phaedrus 1.29.11. At Sen. *Ep.* 95.67 the word itself means 'spiritless,' though the context implies 'through low birth.' For 'mean and vile' the only convincing instance after early drama is Sall. *Cat.* 11.2, where *ignavus* is contrasted with *bonus*. The phrase *sordido premitur iugo* (267) is cited in support of *ignavum*, but *sordido* there means primarily 'ignominious' to Thebes itself (so rightly *OLD* s.v. 7).

Herc 299
For defence of the paradosis see *CP* 84 (1989) 246.

Herc 321
Though certainty is out of reach because of our limited understanding of this adventure of Hercules, there are at least reasonable grounds for printing *abît* (*abiit* A) in preference to *adît* (*adit* ut vid. E[1], *adiit* FMN).[11] *Abît* in the sense 'escaped, came off' (*OLD* s.v. 7a) matches the topic of escape from impassable places (317f.). Furthermore *abît* allows *fretum* to be governed by *per*, as *plagas* and *harenas* are. (For *abire* with *per* cf. *Tro* 460.) Leo's choice of the weaker *adît* is typical of his prejudice for E readings. It involves not only an awkward hyperbaton in which *adît*, though enclosed in the noun-phrase of *harenas*, governs the noun-phrase of *fretum* (Leo 1.19), but also the unusual correlative use of *que . . . et*: the combination of these two difficulties strains credulity. (*Adire* is nowhere else used intransitively in STrag, and it is unclear what sense an intransitive use would have here.)

If *abît* is read, then *fretum* must refer to the Syrtes rather than Ocean, since Hercules escaped through the former (324 *maria superavit pedes*); Bill. ad 321f. gives ancient references to the tides of the Syrtes. In this case we have a kind of pleonasm familiar in STrag, in which an allusive reference comes first (319–22[a]) and is followed by an explicit reference (*Syrtium*). Cf. e.g. *Med* 466–68 *revolvat animus igneos tauri halitus,/interque saevos gentis indomitae metus/armifero in arvo flammeum Aeetae pecus* (*-que* introduces the restatement, as *cumque* in *Herc* 322), 525f. Repetition of *cum* introduces a new aspect of the same event, as at *Thy* 552f. *Ira cum magnis agitata causis/gratiam rupit cecinitque bellum,/cum leves frenis sonuere turmae . . .*

Herc 336
Tarrant suggests that this line may be another instance of "collaborative interpolation" (see above on 83), designed to expand Lycus' already expansive catalogue of his realm by introducing the popular motif of the Isthmus (1989 141f. with fn. 42).[12]

---

[11] Zw. 1988 336 accepted the arguments of my comm. in favour of the A reading; but *adit* still stood in the 1993 printing of the OCT.

[12] Zw., who first regarded the line as spurious (e.g. 1976, 182), later defended it on the grounds that its interweaving of two noun-attribute phrases is in Sen.'s

Herc 362

Zw. proposed to write *alterna* for EA *aeterna* (1976 202f.), but refrained from adopting the conjecture in the OCT: see *KK*. The decisive point against the conjecture lies not in the fact that the pleonasm of the transmitted *aeterna semper* can be parallelled (which was never in doubt), but in the use of *mortalis*. This word is used in STrag not in the general sense of 'human,' 'person,' but either in contrast to the eternal (gods 448, Fate *Oed* 983) or in reference to death (*Tro* 52, *Pha* 475, *Ag* 589; similarly *Pha* 761). Here, then, Sen. employs it to construct a contrast with *aeterna*.

Herc 380

Patriam (EA) is defended by the imitation at *HO* 1492 *abstuli patriam lares*, where A's interpolation *patrio a lare* trivialises the phrase as does Bücheler's *patrium* (sc. *larem*) here.

Herc 390

Pierrot 178 conclusively defended the transmitted *superba* against the conjecture *superbo* (Ascensius, Grotius). Consequently editors rightly abjured the conjecture until it was revived by Zw., who does not however answer Pierrot. The crucial sentences of Pierrot's discussion are as follows. "Non de superbia Niobes, sed de ejus superbiae poena, hic dicendum est, ut praecedentia continuentur. "I, superbe, inquit Megara, spiritus feroces gere: sequitur superbos ultor deus . . . [sic] Superbam illam Nioben vide; riget luctu", etc. Confirmat hanc interpretationem sequens versus *moestusque*, etc. in quo de dolore tantum et supplicio Tantalidos dicitur. Qui *superbo* substituerunt, causam poenae cum ipsa poena miscuerunt: ea distingue, et lege *riget superba*, quod non secus accipiendum est ac *riget propter superbiam*. In Statio quidem, Theb. IV, 576, dicitur Niobe *tumido luctu percensere funera* . . .: sed alia est Statii, alia Senecae sententia: Statius pervicacem Niobes superbiam describit; Seneca vero Nioben eo tantum memorat, ut ejus exemplo discat Lycus, quae maneat superbos poena."

Herc 430

The *-que* here both makes an inference ('and so') and denotes the heated tone of the question. For the latter function cf. the use of *et*

---

manner (*KK*); but that mannerism is, of course, easily and frequently imitated, e.g. *Oct* 36, 42 etc., *HO* 16, 18, 23 etc.

to introduce a question "cum affectu quodam (plerumque indignatione)," *TLL* 5.2.890.68ff. Bill. ad loc. regards these two functions as mutually exclusive, but both are present in *et* at *Ag* 961 *et esse . . . te parem nobis putas?*, "And so you think yourself our match?", and there is no obvious reason why they should not be combined similarly in *-que*.

***Herc* 436**

The justification of Bentley's change of *loquentem* to *sequentem* would be to provide a cue for Megara's answer in 437 (so *KK*). But Lycus' reference to the underworld is itself sufficient to trigger Megara's counter-reference to the heavens, as 422f. shows (cf. 422 *mersus inferis* with 436 *tenebrae premunt*). *Loquentem* counters Megara's claim in 435 by implying a logos/ergon contrast, viz. that vaunts of Hercules' all-conquering *virtus* are disproved by his inability to escape the underworld. This Lycus utterly disparages Hercules, and would not credit him with great ambitions (*sequentem magna*) even in order to imply hubris.

***Herc* 454**

A's *saevas* seems less likely than E's *saeva* to be the result of assimilation. Mayer 1990[2] 273 writes, "Zwierlein [1988 336] preferred E's *saeva* because Sen. nowhere else postpones *aut* to the third place. Is this cogent? If we consult *TLL* II 1565.10–21 we find that those who indisputably set *aut* in the third place (Ovid, Martial among others) do so once and once only. If Zwierlein's line of reasoning is sound, then their texts must be emended." For the conjunction *saeva fera* cf. *Tro* 845, *Thy* 751, *HO* 1327.

***Herc* 490**

Bill. concurs with me in retaining the transmitted *dabis*, but differs in the interpretation of *coniugem dare*, which she understands to mean 'to give a wife [in marriage]'. Doubt is cast on this interpretation by the paucity and lateness of the parallels cited, but chiefly by its inappropriateness to the context. Amphitryon has just said that Antaeus, Busiris and co., though comparable to Lycus, at least did not dishonour the marriage-bed with *stuprum*. As a response to this, Lycus' sentence "What Jove is allowed, a king is allowed" must refer to irregular sexual union. Lycus' next phrase, *Iovi dedisti coniugem*, is shown by context and mythical history alike to mean, "You provided

a wife to Jove," i.e. for an illicit union (with *coniugem* connoting 'an already married woman,' viz. Alcmena): the phrase could scarcely be taken, even momentarily, to mean, "You gave Jove a bride." Then the next phrase *regi dabis* is understood in the same sense, "you will provide a wife [an already married woman, viz. Megara] to a king." In the following two lines Lycus continues to speak of these two unions as adulterous (n.b. *viro probante*). He does not revert to the possibility of marriage until 493, and then without conviction.

***Herc* 526–32**

In my comm. I took the subjunctives *regnet, exagitet* etc. as representing an inference, drawn from events, about Fortuna's wishes: "Eurystheus (it seems) is to rule at his ease, while Hercules must labour constantly." This use of the subjunctive is closely parallelled, in a similar context of unjust destinies, at Stat. *Theb.* 10.800. Menoeceus' mother contrasts her own innocence with the incestuous motherhood of Jocasta, and complains, *Quid refert? potitur natis Iocasta ducesque/regnantesque videt: nos saeva piacula bello/demus*, that is, "What difference does it make? Jocasta possesses her sons, and sees them leaders and kings, while I (it seems) am to provide a cruel expiation [viz. Menoeceus] for the war." Since *potitur* is a statement, it seems unlikely that *demus* here is an indignant question.

***Herc* 538**

No satisfactory explanation has been given of E's subjunctive *tenderent*, and the correctness of a pluperfect indicative (A *tenderant*) contrasting with the present *teritur* is shown by the Ovidian source-passages *Trist.* 3.10.31 *quaque rates ierant, pedibus nunc itur* and *Pont.* 4.10.33f. *ut, qua remus iter pulsis modo fecerat undis,/siccus contempta nave viator eat.* Though the unreduplicated perfect stem *tend-* is nowhere else securely attested (Neue-Wagener *Formenlehre*[3] 3.350), it is supported here by metre, sense and sources. To borrow George Goold's phrase, we cannot expect rarities to have occurred twice in order that they may have occurred once. It is surprising that Zw. considered conjecturing *panderant*, and that Bill. adopts that conjecture, since *pand-* as a perfect stem is unknown outside the grammarians, one of whom denies its existence (*TLL* 10.1.193.8–14).

Herc 553

My comm. explains and illustrates the appositional use of *sidera* meaning "as stars, in starlike form," in reference to St Elmo's fire.[13] For the apposition indicating a function, *KK* cites Ov. *Trist.* 1.10.45f. *vos quoque Tyndaridae . . . fratres,/mite precor duplici numen adesse viae*, i.e. "as a kindly power."

Both Zw. 1988 336 and Bill. cite the discussion of Hillen 1989 52 as justifying replacement of *sidera* by the conjecture *sidere* (Housman, Ker). All that Hillen does, however, is to define the usage of *sidera* in very circumscribed terms ("placement of an attribute-less predicative substantive in the nominative next to an apposition,")[14] and then declare it unparallelled in Sen. If a transmitted reading makes good sense, as *sidera* does, there is no requirement that a phrase must exist parallelling it in every last detail. Why, for example, is the nominative case an issue? The absence of an attribute indicating benevolence such as we find at Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.8f. *proferte benigna/sidera* is not a problem in view of the presence of *succurrunt.*

The conjecture *sidere* could itself be said to import a rarity, since this noun is plentiful in STrag in the forms *sidera* and *sidus* (27 uses), but occurs only once in another form (*siderum Pha* 1112).

Herc 634

For the conjecture *impar*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 303.

Herc 660

The meaning of the transmitted *iura* is uncertain. The word has a range of possible meanings, e.g. 'judgements, powers, laws,' but the context does not single out any of these as particularly appropriate. It is telling that Bill.'s translation avoids rendering the word at all: "dass ich ungestraft kundtun darf, was die Erde drunten geheimnisvoll umschliesst." The commentaries of Zw. and Bill. seem to take the word to mean the 'laws, regulations' governing a particular region (here the underworld), but such phrases naturally have a genitive of the region concerned (e.g. *Med* 615 *temerata ponti iura*), which is notably

---

[13] Manil. 1.365 and Ov. *Trist.* 1.4.2 give no support to the conjecture *sidere* here (*pace* Bill.), since they refer to constellations, not to St Elmo's fire.

[14] "Setzung eines attributloss prädikativen Substantivs im Nominativ neben einer Apposition."

missing here. Nor does the physical description *abdita et operta terris* consort well with the abstract 'laws.'

What Theseus intends to describe is not a special aspect of the underworld, viz. its laws, but the place itself and Hercules' exploit there. The famous *descriptio inferorum* of *Aeneid* 6 is in the immediate background, and the generality of Vergil's phrase *res alta terra . . . mersas* (267), "things buried in the deep earth," is matched by Sen.'s neuter plural *abdita et operta terris*, "things hidden and covered by the earth" (which is in fact what Bill. translates). *Iura* must therefore be corrected to *iure*, i.e. "things properly hidden" etc. *Iure* is often used in religious contexts, e.g. Ov. *Fasti* 3.243, 3.762, 6. 293, *Trist.* 2.37f., 4.1.49. Sen. likes to use participles substantivally of things hidden, e.g. *Med* 232f. *trans Pontum quoque/summota,* 679 *arcana secreta abdita, Pha* 939 *longinqua clausa abstrusa, Oed* 851 *obducta longo temporum tractu, Ben.* 7.3.3 *remota et solitudinibus interclusa, Ep.* 68.4 *condita et abstrusa, NQ* 2.9.4 *abdita et inclusa,* 5.15.2 *in tenebris male abstrusa.*

***Herc* 670**

Bill.'s comm. treats the transmitted *afflicti* as meaning 'distressed, sad.' (Her translation, on the contrary, renders it with "bleich"—not a meaning of *afflicti*.) But there is no particular sight or situation here to distress the Sun (contrast e.g. 60f., *Oed* 2–4). Rather the focus of 668–72 is purely on the quality of the light that filters into the cave, and Bentley's *affecti*, 'weakened,' fits this physical description (see further my comm.).

***Herc* 679**

Bill. ad loc. and at *SSU* 95f. reports that the genitive singular of *sinus* is found nowhere else in poetry. This finding virtually eliminates E's reading *immensi sinus*, and leaves us with A's ablative *immenso sinu*. The word *sinus* here (whether in the genitive or ablative) has traditionally been taken to refer to the curving path of the river, on the basis of V. *Aen.* 6.132 *Cocytusque sinu labens circumvenit atro*, where the river similarly bounds the underworld. But Bill. is perhaps right to take *immenso sinu* as an ablative of place amplifying *intus*, "within, in an immense abyss," cf. e.g. Lucr. 2.965 *suis in sedibus intus*, "in their habitations within," V. *Aen.* 7.192 *tali intus templo*, "within, in such a temple." Bill. compares *Oed* 582, where *immenso sinu*, similarly at verse-end, similarly refers to an immense abyss; add *Thy* 1024 *immani sinu.*

***Herc* 683f.**

Of nine uses of the singular ablative *unda* in STrag, eight refer to particular rivers, one to a narrow strait, and only one to the sea (*Pha* 182); of ten uses of the plural ablative *undis*, seven refer to the sea, and only one to a particular river (*Tro* 847). This pattern of usage strengthens the arguments given in my comm. for preferring A's singular *incerta . . . unda* here to E's plural *incertis . . . undis*.

***Herc* 690**

The transmitted ablative *taxo imminente* (best taken as local) is surprising, since the *comae* of 689 belong to this yewtree, which would justify a genitive, and since there is already one ablatival phrase *opaca fronde* in this clause. Hence Leo conjectured *taxum imminentem qua tenet* e.q.s. But in view of Sen.'s predilection hereabouts for using two noun-attribute phrases in the ablative in the same clause (665f., 679f.), one should probably make no change.[15]

***Herc* 742**

There is a general similarity between this passage and *Oct* 472ff., as *KK* notes, but not a phrase-by-phrase parallelism such that the phrase *tempus . . . irae dare* there would require us to adopt the late reading *animoque parcit* here. In fact the two passages have a rather different focus. In the lines in *Oct*, deification rewards a statesman of varied qualities: eminence among peers, patriotism, mercy, abstinence from bloodshed, control of anger, peace-making, *virtus* in general. But in the *Herc* passage the focus thoughout, from 737 to 745, is exclusively on abstinence from bloodshed as indicative of mild rule, and the transmitted reading *animaeque parcit*, "and spares life," is one more restatement of this theme, in a typical example of Senecan pleonasm (v. Carlsson 1926 71ff., *SSU* 105–15). Consequently the argument which Bill.'s commentary presents in favour of the reading *animoque parcit*, viz. that it fills out the portrait of a mild ruler by introducing a *new* trait, is in fact in its disfavour.

[15] The source is V. *Aen.* 6.283f. *ulmus opaca, ingens, quam sedem Somnia vulgo/ vana tenere ferunt.* Vergil's phrase *quam sedem . . . Somnia . . . tenere ferunt* might be thought to support the transmitted construction *quam tenet . . . Sopor* here (as Zw. implies by citing the Vergilian passage in his app. crit.). But since Sen. is varying Vergil's syntax, shifting the tree from the nominative into another case and transferring *opacus* to the foliage (Bill. ad loc.), he might also have varied the construction of the relative clause from *quam* to *qua*.

***Herc* 743**

In my comm. I followed Bentley in finding it unlikely that Sen. would use *felix* of the same person twice in two lines without rhetorical point; consequently I accepted Bentley's conjecture *vivacis* for MSS *felicis* in 743. Bill. defends *felicis aevi* by reference to the phrase *felix saeculum* at *Apocol.* 1.1 and 4.1 poet. 23f. *felicia lassis/saecula praestabit.* This is the usage of *felix* which *TLL* classifies as "de temporum spatiis . . . principum auspiciis initis" (6.1.448.55ff.), a usage which refers to the beneficial effects of the benign ruler on his subjects and the world; *felicis aevi* here will therefore mean "of an auspicious epoch" (though Bill. inconsistently renders it "eines glücklichen Lebens" in her translation). But again this interpretation diffuses the narrow focus of the passage, which is not on benefits to the world at large, but on the rewards of mild rule *to the ruler himself.*

The phrase *vivacis aevi* means "of a lengthy life-span," not "of old age" ("hohes Alter") as Zw. 1988 337 suggests. Zw. thinks *vivacis* here could only have a negative connotation, viz. "*too* long-lived," citing 1026f. *nimis/vivax senectus* and *Tro* 42 *vivax senectus*, but of course that connotation comes from the contexts of those two phrases, aided at 1026f. by *nimis*, and it is not inherent in the word *vivax*.

***Herc* 778**

The general preference for *tum* over *tunc* in Latin poetry before Sen. is present but not pronounced in STrag: *tum* is transmitted by EA unanimously 21 times, *tunc* 13 times. Before words beginning with a consonant, however, the preference in STrag is more pronounced, at 19:7. See Keulen ad *Tro* 178.

***Herc* 778–81**

Monstra obviously applies compendiously to the whole list which follows (*pace* Bill.), exactly as in Vergil's list of underworld monsters at *Aen.* 6.285–89, which similarly begins with Centaurs. Since Vergil's list includes Centaurs, Hydra and Geryon (all Hercules' foes), and since Sen. mentions Centaurs and Hydra, it is likely that a reference to Geryon stood in the lacuna in which the interpolated line 779 now stands (see my comm. on 778f.).[16] Sen.'s reference may have been allusive, since Geryon is the only monster identified allu-

[16] For the conjunction of lacuna and interpolation, cf. note below on *Tro* 994–96.

sively in Vergil's list, and attracts allusive phrases (my comm. on *Herc* 232). References by allusion rather than by name are, of course, particularly liable to corruption.

Herc 799

The A reading *clepit* is initially attractive as *lectio difficilior* and parallelled at *Med* 156 (Carlsson 1929 43f.), but the word's connotations of stealth, theft etc. make it inappropriate to this context (Ageno ad loc.).[17] Where interpolation of a roughly synonymous word has occurred, the culprit is far more likely to be A than E: Zw. lists instances at *Proleg.* 42f., see also the index of *KK* under 'Fehlertypen, Synonymen-Variation.' A also likes to borrow material jackdaw-like from elsewhere in the corpus (here *Med* 156): in this play alone cf. 36f., 112, 212, 219 with my comm. ad loc. For the *figura etymologica* of *tegmine* . . . *tegit* cf. *Thy* 1001 *gemitu* . . . *gemit* and my comm. on *Herc* 1093 *virtusque viro*.

Herc 814

Conjectural replacements for the transmitted *bono* include *novos*, 'inexperienced,' in agreement with *oculos* (Ageno) and *novus*, 'unfamiliar,' in agreement with *nitor* (Bücheler apud Leo). It is noteworthy that Zw. 1987 84, though deciding for the latter, did not find a parallel for subject and attribute in agreement at successive line-ends in trimeters (he cites only *Med* 818f., in anapaests). My check of *Herc* found no instance of successive line-ends in trimeters involving a noun and attribute in agreement in any grammatical case. (I excluded instances where another attribute in agreement intervenes between the two line-ends, 269f., 764.)

Herc 904

There are no firm grounds for choosing between A's *virenti* and E's *virente*, but spondees are far more common than iambs in the third feet of Sen.'s trimeters. Of the three instances where EA unanimously transmit an ablative ending *-e* on an adjectival participle, two are in tribrachic feet (*Ag* 449, *Thy* 780; not *Oed* 1049).

---

[17] Bill.'s notion that Hercules uses *stealthy* self-concealment in order to frighten Cerberus is over-ingenious, and out of character for Sen.'s Hercules.

Herc 960

Watt's rejection of the imperfect subjunctive *pararet* (1989 330) is perhaps correct, but prudence suggests the need for further discussion before a change is adopted. A present subjunctive would, of course, be unexceptionable (cf. *Ag* 552). But "What if he were now saying no?" is not very different from, or inferior to, "What if he were now to say no?" An imperfect subjunctive is sometimes used without much distinction from a present subjunctive, as a present possibility is sometimes hardly distinguishable from an imminent future possibility: cf. *Tro* 967f. *vellet, Pha* 950 *consumeremus* (n.b. *numquam*), *Oed* 298 *exciperem, Ag* 248 *daret*, ps.-Sen. *HO* 1388 *domaret* (after *ruat, flagret*: v. Mynors on V. *Georg*. 4.117), *Oct* 917–22 *darent* etc.

Watt conjectures *pararit*, which he means as a future perfect. Such forms with *-aver-* shortened to *-ar-* are perfect subjunctive rather than future perfect elsewhere in STrag:[18] not, of course, a strong objection, if an objection at all. Bill. adopts *pararit* but reinterprets it as a perfect subjunctive with a potential sense. So far as I know, a perfect subjunctive never has a potential sense in STrag. Is there a clear example anywhere in Latin of the perfect subjunctive used in a potential sense after *si*? Bill. cites only Petr. 125.3, where the forms *miserit* etc. could be future perfect.

Herc 980

Arguments for A's *marcent* as against E's *Macetum* are given in my comm. *Marceo* is used of the withering of vegetation at Stat. *Theb*. 10.98, *Silv*. 5.5.29, Mart. 5.78.12, cf. *marcor* at Sen. *NQ* 3.27.4; the vegetation here would be that for which verdant Tempe was famous. Zw. 1988 336f. objects that *marceo* normally bespeaks a *gradual* withering, but of course the presence of violent supernatural evil (here the Giants) makes the natural world behave abnormally, as in response to Medea's magic at *Med* 754–69 or the presence of Tantalus' ghost at *Thy* 107–19, where the trees drop their fruit and the snows disappear suddenly, not gradually.

The form *Macetum*, a genitive plural of *Macetae*, is found in dactylic poetry in general references to the Macedonians, e.g. Manil. 4.762 *Macetum tellus*, Luc. 5.2 *in M. terras*, 10.16 *antiquas M. vires*, Stat. *Silv*.

---

[18] *Phoen* 206 *efferarit, Pha* 718 *expiarit, Oed* 389 *contaminarit, Thy* 1106 *pararis*.

4.6.106 *regnator M.* It would, however, be odd in reference to a specific place, "Tempe of the Macedonians."

***Herc* 999**

Zw. followed by Bill. supports Withof's conjecture *clava* for *aula*, but without resolving the difficulties which it engenders in the phrase *deiecto/disiecto obice*. Why is the wielding of the club to be *subsequent* to the attack on the *obex*, as indicated by the perfect participle? The club, if employed at all hereabouts, would surely have made a good battering-ram. And which barrier is this *obex*? The rest of the clause gives no clue. The next clause, *rumpatque postes*, suggests retrospectively that it is either the cross-bar of the door or the barrier of the door itself (respectively *OLD* s.v. 1a and 1b), but gives no guidance between these options. Neither difficulty arises with Baden's conjecture *valva*, for which I argue in my comm.

***Herc* 1012**

Bill. prefers A's *latebras* to E's *latebram* on the grounds that the plural is much more common than the singular in poetry. But that very fact raises the possibility that *latebras* is a normalisation here. Bill's view that Sen. used *latebram* at *Oed* 362 to avoid a succession of four words ending in *s* is questionable, since Sen. does not avoid such a sequence elsewhere (so Timpanaro 2000 146), e.g. *Oed* 342f., 532, 541, 580f.

***Herc* 1023**

See my comm. To assume that the original reading was *pavor* (so Zw.) entails supposing two separate corruptions, to *timor* in E and to the meaningless *puer* in A. This multiplies hypotheses. To my mind A's *puer* is best understood as the intrusion of a gloss *pueri* (pedantically identifying the owner of the *spiritus*), adjusted to *puer* for the metre. For such intrusions see index under "glosses", e.g. the discussions of *HO* 373 and 1079.

***Herc* 1028–30**

A problematic passage: the text as transmitted gives no explicit indication of the point at which Amphitryon turns from self-address to call to Hercules, and the vagaries of *induo* can make grown scholars weep. For the transmitted *pectus in tela indue*, M. Müller 1898 10f.

proposed *pectus en telo indue*. The chief attraction of this conjecture[19] is that its *en* marks the point at which Amphitryon turns to Hercules, and that *en* is well parallelled both in the function of attracting another's attention (*Pha* 54) and of inviting an attack on oneself (*Med* 966, *Herc* 1172). The rest of the conjecture, however, is unimpressive. A single arrow (*telo*) is parsimonious by Senecan standards, and Müller's defence, "uno certe, non pluribus telis . . . conficere poterat Hercules Amphitryonem," confuses factual with rhetorical criteria. More problematic, and in fact fatal to the conjecture, is the issue of the meaning of *pectus telo indue*, about which Müller was silent. The phrase was presumably to be taken in the sense "impale *my* breast with an arrow," and *KK* cites in support V. *Aen.* 10.681f. *an sese mucrone ob tantum dedecus amens/induat*. But *induo* in usages of this sort is regularly *reflexive*, the object being either a reflexive pronoun or part of the speaker's own body: instances are collected at *OLD* s.v. 5b (where however Ov. *Met.* 9.82 scarcely belongs). Sen. would hardly give Amphitryon a phrase suggesting self-address ("impale *your* breast") at the very moment when he begins to address Hercules.

My own conjecture *pectori en tela indue*, "Here, plunge your arrows into my breast" (1981 69f. and comm.) retains the desirable plural *tela*, but is open to the objection that there is no parallel for elision of a long syllable before *en* in poetry from Ennius to Juvenal (Kershaw 244). Axelson's version *pectori tela indue*, reported in *KK*, removes this difficulty while retaining the advantages of the other conjectures, in that it directs *indue* to the same addressee (Hercules) as *converte*, and contrasts 'arrows' with 'club' as alternative weapons. I am therefore inclined to adopt it. Admittedly *indue* with Dat. elsewhere means 'thrust into' (*Phoen* 180 *nunc manum cerebro indue*, Col. 8.11.4) rather than 'fire [missiles] into,' but in view of the use of *infigo* of arrows and spears this is perhaps not a difficulty. The absence of an explicit indication of apostrophe (*en* vel sim.) is not necessarily an objection in STrag.

The alternative is to retain the transmitted *pectus in tela indue*, which must be continued self-address, "thrust your breast against his weapons"

[19] In its justification Müller argued that Sen. nowhere else repeats *in* with *induere*, but since there are only three places in the tragedies where he could have done so (*Herc* 1312, *Phoen* 180, *Oed* 341), and since *induere in* is well established in Latin generally, the argument is not a powerful one.

(with *tela* = *arma*, as e.g. at 1053, 1244, *Phoen* 285, 409); for the sense cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.10.31f. *induat adversis contraria pectora telis/miles*. Address to Hercules will now start at the beginning of 1029, and it will be necessary to emend *vel*, which could have arisen through ambiguous compendia and/or an assumption that *indue* and *converte* are addressed to the same person. One replacement would be *en*, which would have the advantages noted in the first paragraph of this note. Another would be *huc*: initial *huc* can have the function of drawing attention as well as indicating direction (*Tro* 705, *Med* 945, *Pha* 1247, *Oed* 334). A third would be *iam*. (All these suggestions were made by me in 1981 69 and comm.)[20]

Herc 1063f.

The MSS have *solvite tantis animum monstris,/solvite, superi*, except that E adds an unmetrical *o* before *superi*. The sequence dactyl-anapaest in *solvite superi* is unparallelled in the anapaests of STrag, though there are three instances in ps.-Sen. For that reason in my edition I printed Leo's rearrangement *solvite tantis animum, o superi,/solvite monstris*. But this in itself introduces a rarity, since Sen. avoids elision in the second metra of dimeters (see Appendix): there are only seven instances in the 853 dimeters of STrag, six of them in what I regard as the early plays *Ag, Oed, Pha*. I am now inclined, therefore, to accept the unique sequence *solvite superi*, and to assume that *HO* 186 *fingite, superi* is an echo of it, and that E has here inserted *o* to mark the address (as A does at *Med* 465, and perhaps E at *Herc* 277).

Herc 1089–91

Bill. (ad loc. and *SSU* 133 fn.) seems to me mistaken in classifying this simile with short similes of the type seen e.g. at 1046f. *ad terram ruit, ut caesa silvis ornus*. It is characteristic of such short similes that they lack a finite verb,[21] which can easily be supplied from the apodosis: thus at 1046f. "he collapses to the ground, as an ash-tree felled in the woods <collapses>." In contrast, the present simile contains

---

[20] Axelson apud *KK* conjectures *vel stipitem istum huc* e.q.s. in 1029. Given Axelson's version of 1028, the sole function of this *huc* would be to indicate direction with *converte*. But, as noted above, lack of explicitness is not necessarily a sign of corruption in Sen.: for *convertere* without an indication of direction cf. e.g. *De Ira* 2.34.1 *mures formicaeque, si manum admoveris, ora convertunt*.

[21] See Fitch in *TAPA* 106 (1976) 114 with fn.

two finite verbs, and it is the whole apodosis which needs to be inferred from the simile, just as in the epic examples cited in my comm. ad loc.

The app. crit. of the OCT, followed by Bill., errs in saying "*post* tumet *lacunam statuit Withof*." Withof 95f. did indeed believe that the simile must have had an apodosis; however, he located this apodosis not in a lacuna after line 1091, but rather in what he conjectured to be the original wording of that line itself, viz. *ita mens ira cessante tumet*. (Withof's alternative proposal, which he himself disfavoured but which others might prefer, was to write *velut* for *sed ut* in 1089.)

Herc 1122–37

I suggested in my comm. (p. 413) that the bodies of Hercules' children are wheeled onstage (though remaining in the house by convention) towards the end of this ode, as they are in the corresponding ode of Euripides' *Heracles* (1029ff.). This stage action could coincide to good dramatic effect with the choral address to the children which begins at 1122. It could also remove any initial doubt about who is addressed in 1122ff., though (as I noted ad loc.) the identity of a new addressee is often left to be inferred from the context and content of the address in STrag.

Herc 1158

Originally perhaps *in fetus*: see fn. below on *HO* 1500.

Herc 1195

Quot homines, tot interpunctiones. Carlsson 1948 42f., to whom Zw. refers in *KK*, writes: "As an expression of Hercules' first immediate reaction in face of the discovery that the weapon of murder was his own, an exclamation *tincta Lernaea nece* may be said to be both psychologically and dramatically preferable to a complete sentence, as it were calmly checking the fact." But this notion of a participial phrase used as an exclamation seems improbable, and Carlsson gives no parallel. Zw. himself takes *tincta Lernaea nece* as a main clause, with ellipse of *est* as e.g. at 955 *perdomita tellus*. This gives the required sequence of observation followed by conclusion: "It [the shaft] is steeped in the Hydra's fatal blood: *now* I recognise my arrows." But in Zw.'s text the only thing constituting *tincta Lernaea nece* as a main clause is the modern punctuation, since without such punctuation *tincta* would inevitably be taken as a subordinate participle agreeing

either with *harundo* or with *tela*.[22] It is therefore necessary to write *tincta Lernaea est nece* with Leo. For other punctuations see my comm.

Herc 1237

E has *usquam*, PT *umquam*, CS the impossible *numquam*. Bill. chooses *umquam* because it is the more common word in this kind of general question; but this very fact raises the possibility of normalisation (cf. above on 1012), a frequent phenomenon in A.

Herc 1270

On the choice between E's *violatum* and A's *violatae* see *KK* p. 303 (ad *Thy* 346).

Herc 1293f.

Like Gronovius, Bill. takes the phrase *onus omne media parte quae mundi sedet/dirimitque superos* to mean the earth, but this interpretation is improbable for several reasons. First, since Hercules is standing on the earth he could scarcely pull the weight of the earth down on himself. Second, on this interpretation *dirimitque superos* must mean *dirimit superos et inferos*, "separates those upon/above the earth from those below it" ("superos dirimit, puta nos & Antipodas," Gronovius);[23] but such an idea would need more elaboration, since *dirimit superos* alone is naturally understood to mean, "separates off the gods" (i.e. from humans). Third, the modes of self-punishment which Hercules contemplates are drawn by Sen. from past or future mythical episodes of Hercules' life: his rescue of Prometheus (1206–10), his descent to the underworld (1221–26), his self-immolation on Oeta (1226f., 1285–87). Similarly 1293f. recalls his previous *bearing* of part of the cosmos, which was of course heaven (69–72, 424, 528, 1102), not earth.

Herc 1297

The E reading *immisit* would be superior (as I earlier took it to be) if the meaning "shot it *at* the boy by means of your hands" (*manibus* ablative) were clearly established by the rest of the sentence. But

[22] In contrast, at *Ag* 701f. *quid illa felix turba fraterni gregis? exhausta nempe* the ellipse of *est* with *exhausta* creates no uncertainty about the rhetorical and grammatical structure, as is shown by the agreement of editors over the punctuation.

[23] Bill. tries to evade this consequence, but unpersuasively.

Bill. is right that the reading cannot escape ambiguity, since it could readily be taken to mean "put it into your hands" (*manibus* dative). For that reason A's unambiguous *emisit* is preferable.

Herc 1312

The text problem cannot be considered in a vacuum without consideration of the dramatic situation, for which see my comm. on 1300[b]–1313. If I understand that situation aright, Amphitryon has been warning in the previous lines (1300[b]–10[a]) that his son's intended suicide will result in his own death also, and thus add a conscious crime (1300f.) to those Hercules committed unconsciously in madness. The anguish of losing his son will snuff out Amphitryon's spirit, already weakened by old age and sufferings (1308[b]–10[a]). But in the middle of 1310 there is a change. Angered by Hercules' slowness in "granting him life," and determined to force his son's hand, Amphitryon draws a sword and threatens imminent suicide unless Hercules relents. The focus, therefore, is no longer on the pathos of Amphitryon's old age (as it would be if Withof's conjecture *senile* were adopted), but on the deadly weapon, *letale ferrum*, which Amphitryon draws and threatens to use. For the force of *letale ferrum* see my comm. ad loc. MSS corruption may have been initiated by misreading of *pectori* as *pectus*, which seems to have occurred at 1028 also.

Herc 1317

A defence of EA *afflictos* against recc. *afflicti* is given on p. 480 of my comm. For *affligor* in the sense 'collapse, fall to the ground' cf. Plaut. *Mil.* 1331 *tene mulierem, ne affligatur, TLL* 5.1.1233.47–55.

***Tro* 15f.**

E has *congestis iacent/tectis adusti*, while A has *congesti iacent/tectis adustis*. The latter is clearly superior, for two reasons.

1. "Charred" applies better to the houses, with their flammable materials, than to the walls; conversely the walls provide a more spectacular instance of "piled" rubble than the houses. For burnt houses and fallen walls cf. 622 *lapsis . . . muris*, 1085f. *semusta tecta vel saxum imminens/muri cadentis*. Similarly in the narrative of *Aen.* 2 Troy's houses are burnt (e.g. 310–12, 478) but the walls are toppled (608–10).
2. The phrase *congesti iacent* yields the familiar pattern of *iacere* closely associated in sense with an adjoining perfect participle in the nominative, e.g. *Oed* 197 *prostrata iacet* "lies prostrate," cf. *Herc* 1160 *confecti iacent, Tro* 238 *iacuit peremptus, Med* 630 *sparsus iacuit, Pha* 5 *subiecta iacent, Oed* 789 *defunctus iacet*, 1040 *iacet perempta, Ag* 465f. *iacent/deserta, Thy* 197 *abiectus iacet.*

Since *congerere* means to heap *up*, *congesti* is not a synonym here for 'collapsed, overthrown' etc.; rather it governs the dative *tectis adustis*, giving a pathetic picture of the walls "lying in heaps *upon* the charred houses." For *congerere* with dative cf. Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 1.7.2 (*mala*) *quae mihi Fortuna . . . congessit*, Sen. *Clem.* 1.14.2 *ambitiosae maiestati quidquid potuimus titulorum congessimus*, ps.-Sen. *HO* 1153 *Pindo congestus Athos*, Suet. *Nero* 19 *humum . . . corbulae congestam.*[1]

***Tro* 45f.**

A crime greater (*maius*) than what? "Greater than Troy's destruction," thinks Zw. (*KK* on 45), but after 44 *maius* comes too late to make that comparison; anyway Hecuba throughout 1–43 presents

[1] *Tectis adustis* has been taken as an ablative absolute (Keulen); but apart from the question of the sense of *congesti*, one would expect an ablative absolute with a perfect participle to have some temporal sense, which is absent here.

Troy's destruction as a disaster, not as a crime.[2] Henneberger (quoted in *KK* on 46) glosses "quod eo maius est quia ad aras admissum est," but there is not a chance that Sen.'s Latin could mean what Henneberger's Latin means. Leo conjectured *maius admissumst fide*, but the issue is the criminality of Priam's murder, not its credibility. Housman conjectured *maius admissis scelus*, "a crime greater than those previously committed" (on Manilius 2.3): this is vague (*which* previously committed crimes?) and leaves 46 as an anticlimax after the vivid 45.

What would restore vigour to 46, and what *maius* points to, is a typically Senecan comparison with a specific previous crime, cf. e.g. *Oed* 18 *est maius aliquod patre mactato nefas?*, *Ag* 29 *sed maius aliud ausa commisso scelus*, *Thy* 273–76 *vidit infandas domus/Odrysia mensas—fateor, immane est scelus,/sed occupatum: maius hoc aliquid dolor/inveniat.* Such a precise comparison is provided by Bentley's conjecture *Aiacis ausis*, "than the outrage of Ajax," at the beginning of 46, for Ajax dragged Cassandra from sanctuary *at the altar* before raping her. The word *ausis* here will be an allusion to Priam's own words to Pyrrhus just before his death at *Aen.* 2.535 *"at tibi pro scelere" exclamat, "pro talibus ausis . . ."* where *ausis* was regarded as striking and a Vergilian invention (v. Austin ad loc.);[3] Sen. throughout 44–56 is referring, by imitation and divergence, to Vergil's account of Priam's death. So we have: "and a crime committed at the very altar greater than Ajax' outrage, when the ferocious fellow . . ." The latter, of course is Pyrrhus: references to mythical figures other than by name are everywhere in STrag, e.g. *Ag* 13–21, *Herc* 386–89, *Tro* 413 (*ferus* = Achilles), 976, 978, *Med* 415, 441, *Pha* 94, 95 (*revulsam* = Proserpina), *Thy* 721 (*ferus* = Atreus), and often indicate that the figure is too familiar to the speaker to need naming, or that the speaker chooses not to utter the name and/or prefers a more prejudicial identification.

The MSS corruptions in 46 (*aeacis armis* E, *eacide armis* A) can then be explained by scribal expectation of an explicit reference to Pyrrhus (descendant of Aeacus). Henneberger and independently Housman

[2] Watt's proposal (1989 331) to transpose 44 and 45 is presumably intended to forestall the first objection, but it does not meet the second. Furthermore 45 coming after 43 does not seem to me adequately phrased to make a new and intensifying point, as it now must.

[3] For allusion through an unusual word cf. e.g. *Herc* 548 *inremeabilis* with my comm. ad loc.

conjectured *Aeacius* as the patronymic, giving *Aeacius armis cum ferox*, sc. "when the Aeacid, arrogant in arms . . ." *Aeacius* is a very rare form, though secure at Colum. 10.175. But the fact that this conjecture creates an unconvincing word-order in 46,[4] and leaves 45 as an anti-climax, makes it a less preferable solution.

Tro 53

The transmitted *quoddam sacrum/regni iacentis* is a striking and clearly genuine phrase, viz. "a kind of sanctity inherent in fallen kingship." Examples of this use of *sacrum* are collected by *OLD* s.v. 5; they regularly involve, as here, a genitive indicating in what the sanctity inheres, viz. *hospitii, mensae, praetextarum, legationis, regni*. Since this usage is a recent one (*OLD* cites only one instance earlier than Sen.),[5] *quoddam* qualifies it; for this qualifying function, 'a kind of,' see *OLD* s.v. *quidam*[1] 3.[6] The phrase is characteristic of Sen.'s style in using the abstract *sacrum* where we might expect a more concrete noun, cf. e.g. *Tro* 1169 *ubi hanc anilis expuam leti moram*, *Thy* 282f. *ingesta orbitas/in ora patris*.

Tro 74

On the interpretation see *EMC* 29 (1985) 451–52. There is no instance in STrag of a proper name repeated immediately (i.e. without other words intervening), as in Zw.'s reading *Ide/Ide* based on CSV. But repetition of a word at the beginning of successive lines (i.e.

---

[4] In the five instances where the conjunction *cum* is postponed by two words or more in STrag (*Tro* 49, 1040, *Med* 940, *Pha* 766, *Oed* 50), there is usually a special stylistic reason, e.g. separation from another subordinating word. In none of these places is *cum* separated by more than one word from its verb, for reasons of clarity.

N. Heinsius earlier conjectured *Aeacidae ab armis*, i.e. a crime committed "by Pyrrhus' arms." This, however, has the air of a conjecture: since Sen. only once uses *ab* to mean 'by' an agent (*Oed* 684: usually *ab* means 'from' in the plays), he is unlikely to have extended its meaning to 'by' an instrument. Furthermore, it appears from Zw.'s study of elision (*Proleg.* 203–29) that the dipthong *-ae* is never elided before a short syllable in STrag.

[5] Later writers follow Ovid in using the plural *sacra* to reduce ambiguity — an ambiguity that has led to misunderstanding of the present passage.

[6] Axelson's objection that one would have expected *quiddam*, reported by Zw. in his app. crit. and *KK*, shows a tendency to rely on purely verbal parallels, in this case *Ep.* 55.4 *philosophia sacrum quiddam est*, with insufficient regard to context. Clearly "philosophy is a holy kind of thing" is meaningful, whereas "a holy kind of thing belonging to fallen kingship" would not be.

decies . . ./decies) is in keeping with Sen.'s style in anapaests, cf. 132–33 *accipe . . ./accipe*, 160–62 *felix . . ./felix . . ./felix*.

Tro 100

No parallel has been found for *dimitto* used of hair; but since the verb can mean to 'release' from constraint (*OLD* s.v. 7), EA's *dimissa* "goes admirably with *libera nodo*" (Courtney 1970 199). Keulen well cites *Pha* 401f. *nodo comas/coegit emisitque*, where again the constraint/release dichotomy is present.

Tro 120

Schrader followed by Zwierlein replaced EA *iacent* with *patent*, but the paradosis yields the familiar association of *iacere* with an adjacent perfect participle, examples of which are given above on 15: in anapaests cf. *Pha* 5 *subiecta iacent, Oed* 197 *prostrata iacet.* For conjectural replacement of *iacere* with *patere*, see below on *Phoen* 603.

Keulen regards *iacent* as appropriate to an old woman's breasts, comparing Prop. 2.15.21 *inclinatae . . . mammae*, to which may be added Pliny *Ep.* 3.6.3 *papillae iacent.* I would think that that meaning is not strongly present here, and that *iacent* functions almost like an auxiliary verb in combination with the participle, cf. English 'lie wounded, lie dormant' etc.

Tro 176–77

See Fitch 1989 244 and Delz 1989 507, arguing independently that these lines are genuine but that *stravit* has intruded from 183 and displaced a word of opposite meaning such as *volvit* or *tollit.*[7]

In favour of his deletion of 176–77 (1976 183–85 and *KK*) Zw. argues that the appearance of Achilles' ghost in 181 works best as a climax to the narrative if not anticipated by mention of his name, but preceded only by mysterious indications (*monstra* 169) and portents. This is debatable on aesthetic grounds, but the fact is that in comparable narratives such portents are interpreted as indicating the

[7] Such intrusions from other lines are easy to identify when they occur in only one branch of the transmission. The examples cited below on *HO* 1240 fn. show that the intrusive word may be quite different, at least in part, from the original word. Examples in EA are more difficult to identify in the nature of things, but may include *Herc* 94 *specus* from 80 for ?*latus; Tro* 1008 *dira/diras* from 1005, 1007, 1112 for ?*apertas, HO* 1221 *iecur* from 1222 for ?*specus.*

approach of supernatural beings, as in 177 *adesse Achillem sensit*: cf. V. *Aen.* 6.258 *adventante dea*, Sen. *Herc* 523 *audimur! est est sonitus Herculei gradus, Med* 785f., *Oed* 571–73. One could take the view that 177 does not spoil the climax in 181 but prepares it.

Zw. also believes, on the basis of Ov. *Met.* 13.439f., that the seas were stormy enough to prevent the Greeks sailing *before* Achilles' appearance (and consequently could not become stormy at the approach of his ghost, as in Bentley's conjecture *movit* for *stravit*). So the interpolator introduced the familiar topos of seas calmed (*stravit*) by the influence of a sea-god vel sim.[8] But the natural inference from the present scene, especially 164–67, and from 203, is that the delay has just begun, and has been caused by the demands of Achilles' ghost.[9]

Achilles' special relationship with the sea is a repeated motif of this Act (193, 340, 346), which favours the authenticity of 176–77. So does the fact that 177 provides identification for the *tumulus* of 180 (so Fantham ad loc.).

Fantham and Keulen rightly retain the lines, but surprisingly also retain *stravit* at the end of 177, explaining this calming of the waters as the sea's "act of homage, acknowledging Thetis' son as its master" (Fantham). Keulen adds, "both earth and sea tremble, but in a contrasted way . . .: the land heralds Achilles' fury, the sea smooths its waves." But since the earth's trembling took the form of a violent earthquake, the phrase *nec terra solum tremuit* must introduce a comparably violent reaction on the sea's part "by all the rules of logic," as Zw. rightly insisted (*Rez.* 255). It is at the end of the scene, with Achilles' departure, that the sea becomes calm.[10]

[8] Examples in Zw. 1976 185 fn. 19, cf. e.g. *AP* 9.144. Odd that this hypothetical alert interpolator should have failed to perceive the awkwardness of linking earthquake with sea-calm, and of anticipating the sea-calm of 199–202.

[9] This play, when referring to the delay, nowhere specifies marine conditions enforcing it (164, 360–70, 527–28, 552–53, 813, 1126, 1165–67, 1178). One might infer from 199–202 that the ships are becalmed. Line 638 could suggest stormy conditions, but occurs in one of Odysseus' fabrications.

[10] These lines (199^b–202), despite the present tense of *iacent*, do not indicate that the sea "is already lying unruffled" (Fantham p. 235); rather they indicate the result of Achilles' departure by a static snapshot instead of words indicating a process. For comparable snapshots in Senecan narrative cf. *Herc* 809–12, *Oed* 921–24, 958f., *Thy* 755f., 765–67. Here the present tenses have an additional significance that the calm continues, preventing the Greeks from sailing.

Tro 180

The phrase *tumulum levat* means that the weight of the gravemound is eased momentarily, allowing the emergence of Achilles' shade. The weight of earth is usually oppressive to the shades (cf. the well-known formula *sit tibi terra levis*, adapted at 602) and resists their return to the upper world: hence Andromache cries *molire terras, Hector* (682) in calling on her husband's shade to return, and Polyxena's purpose in making Achilles' gravemound *gravem* (1158) is to prevent his re-emerging with another savage demand, as well as to crush him physically. The word *hiatus* (179) often denotes the process or action of yawning open (*OLD* s.v. 1): that process, necessarily violent in this case, heaves up the gravemound, cf. Stat. *Theb.* 8.328 *levem campum* (the effect of an earthquake).

Sen. is here conflating two well-known and divergent narratives, one of which has Achilles' ghost appear above his tomb (Eur. *Hek.* 92f., 109f.) while the other has him emerge from a cleft in the earth (Ov. *Met.* 13.442). The process of conflation leads Sen. to indicate a physical relationship between chasm and gravemound. Otherwise, as in the Axelson-Zw. conjecture *tumulo levis*, it would be unclear why Achilles' shade should emerge from the mound, when it could emerge more directly from the chasm.

Tro 197

The line as transmitted has been understood in three divergent ways.

1. I take it to mean that Achilles "separated the daylight (of the upper world) from the deep darkness (of the nether world)": he did so by closing the chasm which had opened in the earth—and which had allowed unnatural contact between the two realms (179). The unnatural contact of light and darkness is a commonplace of such contexts, e.g. V. *Aen.* 8.243–46, Ov. *Met.* 5.356–58, Sen. *Herc* 50–61. This interpretation gives a good connection between 197 and the following lines, with the balanced *divisit* and *iunxit* referring to different aspects of the same event. In fact we have here a pattern characteristic of Sen.'s narrative style, viz. a cryptic initial statement (197) clarified and amplified by restatement (198–99). Such amplifying clauses are often co-ordinate with the initial statement, cf. *Herc* 664–67, 816–17, *Ag* 489–90, 497–98; this co-ordination can lead to their being misread as referring to separate events, as has happened here and at *Med* 755–56

(v. Costa ad loc.). For the poetic use of *dividere* with an ablative of separation cf. V. *Ecl.* 1.66, Prop. 1.12.3, Stat. *Silv.* 3.2.54.

Zw. objects (1991 119) that 197 taken so would be the result of the actions of 198–99, and could not therefore precede them; but this is excessively logical. Such allusive initial statements often anticipate what follows: e.g. *Thy* 727 *adicitque fratri*, "and he adds him to his brother" (viz. as a sacrificed victim), could be described as the result of the following details, *colla percussa amputat* e.q.s.

2. Gruter, followed e.g. by Gronovius and Fantham, explains that Achilles interrupted the progress of the day by a moment of darkness, before re-entering the underworld. It is doubtful, however, whether Sen. would have expressed such an idea with *divisit*. Baden compared Var. *RR* 1.2.5 *aestivum diem si non diffinderem meo insiticio somno meridie*, but *diem* there refers to the whole day as a unit that can be subdivided, which is not the sense of *diem* here. Nor is it clear that Achilles in particular has such power over the darkness.
3. Keulen believes that the reference is to a spatial, not temporal, splitting—a kind of negative image of Hor. *Carm.* 1.34.5f. *Diespiter/ igni corusco nubila dividens*. He thinks Achilles "has a beam of darkness divide the clear sky." Similarly Boyle believes "a sudden shaft of darkness splits apart the early morning light." It seems to me that the entities *dies* and *nox* are too amorphous and unspecific to convey such a vivid image.

Keulen adduces V. Fl. 5.89–95, where the ghost of Sthenelus rises from his tomb by the seashore to view the Argonauts; the passage is clearly modelled on the present scene (as Langen noted), as well as on A.R. 2.915–21. The relevant lines are 93ff. *atque ea vixdum/ visa viris atra nox protinus abstulit umbra./ille dolens altum repetît chaos.* Here *nox* and *umbra* probably indicate a pall of darkness that falls over Sthenelus' shade in the upper world, preventing him from seeing the Argonauts or they him; hence his sadness (*dolens*) as he returns to the underworld. This looks very much like an variation on Sen.'s line 197 understood in sense 2 or 3 above. But since Sen.'s line is unspecific, Valerius' interpretation of it need not be taken as canonical.

Leo's conjecture *alta nocte mutavit diem*, "exchanged daylight for deep night (of the underworld)" was repeated by Watt 1989 332.

Zwierlein in his most recent discussion of the line (1991)[11] adopted this view of *alta nocte* as an ablative of price or exchange, but combined it with *dimisit*, a conjecture of recc. for *divisit*, to yield "he let the daylight go in favour of deep night." But the ablative of price is relatively rare, except with verbs which themselves indicate exchange, such as *mutare*: Zw. finds only one partial parallel anywhere in Latin for such an ablative used with *dimittere*. Since the paradosis in interpretation (1) above gives the same meaning to *dies* and *nox*, there seems no need for conjecture.

Tro 246

Zw. 1969 152–54 sees that *placita* must refer to Agamemnon's earlier decision to sacrifice Iphigenia (already hinted at in 245), and objects that that decision cannot be said to apply to Polyxena also. But that is exactly what Pyrrhus is doing, for this is tendentious argument, not precise scholarship: he misrepresents the decision at Aulis as a decision in favour of sacrificing virgins when required. Zw. also objects that *iam placita* in 246 would anticipate and so weaken the final flourish of the speech, *solita iam et facta expeto* 249. The last phrase, however, does not repeat *iam placita* but rather caps it: virgin-sacrifice is not only approved, but actual custom and practice.

Rather than *dubitatur et iam*, some editors print *dubitatur etiam?* This is necessary if one accepts Madvig's *placida . . . probas* ("approve a mild policy") for *placita . . . improbas*, as Zwierlein does. This *etiam* will probably mean "still," i.e. "after all I have said," as at *Herc* 965;[12] but this does not cohere well with *nunc*, which does not mean "at this moment" but "in Polyxena's case." The phrase *iam placita* is supported by the parallel phrase *solita iam* in 249.

Tro 251

Agamemnon first generalises about the impulsiveness of young men (250). Then he makes a distinction: in others such *fervor* is caused by immaturity, but in Pyrrhus' case it is inherited (251–52[a]). Three arguments support A's reading *primae* against E's *primus*.

[11] He published four different views of the line in succession, surely a record: details in Keulen ad loc.

[12] So e.g. Fantham. Keulen takes *etiam* here to mean 'really, actually' ("with indignant questions," *OLD* 4c); this would be persuasive if Agamemnon had just begun to hesitate (cf. *Pha* 705, *Ag* 983, *Oed* 678), but Pyrrhus already knows Agamemnon's reservations, which are what the debate is about.

1. To describe such *fervor* as *primus* would indicate that it *is* that of youth (cf. *Ep.* 68.13 *vitia primo fervore adulescentiae indomita*), and would therefore destroy the separate categories Agamemnon is creating, viz. youthful *fervor* and inherited *fervor*. The discussions of Carlsson 1929 42 and Wertis and Fantham ad loc. agree that *primus* destroys the sense.
2. Though *aetas* without qualification can connote 'youth' in some contexts (e.g. *Pha* 446), the whole point of 251 is that a *particular* period of life can cause *fervor*, so it would seem inarticulate to leave *aetas* unqualified here.
3. Sen. likes to create lines containing two noun-adjective pairs in interwoven order, v. my comm. on *Herc* 216–48.

Tro 273^b^–74

It is tempting to take *forsan* as modifying the whole sentence, which does after all describe a possibility not a certainty; *nec mille* e.q.s. would then amplify *brevis* in a satisfactory way: "Perhaps a quick chance will snatch these things, without a thousand ships or ten years." *Forsan* occurs in the same position at *Thy* 747f. *obiecit feris/ lanianda forsan corpora atque igne arcuit*, where it similarly modifies not *lanianda* but the whole sentence.

The conjunction *nec*, however, resists this interpretation, since it would natually limit the reference of *forsan* to line 274. In logical terms there is then an inconsonance between the certainty of "A quick chance will snatch these things" and the diffidence of "perhaps without a thousand ships or ten years." But the certainty of 273[b] is after all more rhetorical than real, and I doubt if the apparent inconsonance is such as to warrant conjecture. *Brevis* corresponds to the *momento* of 263f. *magna momento obrui/ vincendo didici.*

Tro 279

With Lipsius' generally accepted correction of *arguissem* to *arcuissem* the text makes excellent sense: Agamemnon desired the defeat of the Trojans, but *would have prevented* their devastation if possible. 278[b]–79[a] is of course the substance of what is being "confessed" and "apologised for" (276–77[a]): 277[b]–78[a] requires neither confession nor apology, and is inserted only to contrast Agamemnon's conventional intentions with his (alleged) more humane intentions. *Arcuissem* is a potential subjunctive in past time, a usage favoured by Sen. in this play, cf. 235, 269, 555, *Phoen* 231, *Pha* 1039. It implies "I would have prevented,

if it had been possible," and lines 279[b]–285[a] then explain elaborately why it was not possible. *Etiam* here has the connotation of English 'actually, even, in fact' (*OLD* s.v. 4), and serves to mark the notion contained in *ruere . . . arcuissem* as startling, cf. *Med* 498f. *restat hoc unum insuper,/tuis ut etiam sceleribus fiam nocens, Pha* 705, *Oed* 678, *Ag* 983.

There is therefore no need for Madvig's conjecture *utinam arcuissem*, taken from *Thy* 749 *utinam arcuisset.* Its linguistic form is inappropriate, for one can say, "I confess: I wish X," or "I confess that I wish X" (*Med* 544), but hardly "I confess: if only X." In favour of the conjecture, Wertis argues that the clemency of *ruere . . . arcuissem* is based on Agamemnon's new-found mercifulness (263–70), which he wishes he had shown in the past. But in that case Agamemnon would not provide the excuses of 279[b]–85[a], for the point would be simply that at the time of the sack he did not perceive, as he does now, the desirability of clemency. Of course Agamemnon's claim to have intended to spare the Trojans is a rewriting of the past, as is his claim to have tolerated Achilles' outbursts (253).

Tro 280

Zw. justified his exemplary conjecture *ensis* for *hostis* at 1977 154f.; I offered a supporting argument at 1985 452.

Tro 296

Keulen defends the phrase *colla caedantur*: "Since the words *sanguine infuso* accentuate the pouring of blood rather than the slaughtering of animals, the severing of the necks seems a no less appropriate action than the killing of herds." The phrase *Phrygii gregis*, if taken to mean "of *the* Phrygian herd," would oddly imply that the Trojans had only one herd; but it can easily be understood to mean "of *a* Phrygian herd." (The phrase cannot, to judge by Sen.'s use of *grex*, mean generically "of Phrygian cattle.")[13]

[13] Bücheler's conjecture *greges* gains colour from the frequent confusion of *e/i* in the MSS, combined with the fact that Sen. does use the plural *greges* to refer to 'cattle' or other animals (rather than 'herds'), *Herc* 231, 909, *Tro* 1108, *Oed* 382. Bücheler presumably intended *colla* to be taken as accusative of respect (cf. e.g. Ov. *Trist.* 4.2.5f. *collum percussa securi/victima*). The accusative of respect is normally used with an adjective or perfect participle passive in STrag, though not exclusively, cf. *Med* 353 *totos horruit artus*. Zw. takes *opima Phrygii colla . . . greges* as an interwoven appositional phrase (cf. *Herc* 14 *clara gemini signa Tyndaridae*) viz. "let prime necks, Phrygian cattle, be smitten," but this gives an awkward equation of the *collum* with the animal for which neither Zw. nor *TLL* s.v. *collum* provides a parallel.

Tro 304

The paradosis would have to mean "a heart inflamed with sudden desire and for a new love," i.e. the noun *amore* is modified first by an attributive adjective and then by an objective genitive. Most critics have regarded such a construction as impossible, and Wertis in a full discussion finds no parallel for it.[14] The phrase *amor veneris* also seems awkward in the required sense.

Zw. follows Gronovius in assuming a lacuna after 304, but this is an extravagant hypothesis when there is no obvious ellipse of sense. Gronovius writes "deest versus hac sententia, quotiens te desiderium et cupiditas subiit"; presumably *veneris novae* is now objective genitive dependent on *desiderium*, and *quotiens* is correlative with *totiens* (but should not *subiit* be *subierit*?), so "whenever desire and longing for a new amour overcome you, are you alone going to carry off spoils from us?" But the long postponement of *-ne* makes this construction highly improbable.[15]

The more economical assumption is that corruption is confined to 304, and Bentley's *amoris aestu* cures it admirably; *aestu* continues the metaphor of *flammatum*, and *amoris* forms a natural pair with *veneris*. Corruption will have begun with the common *e/i* corruption in *amoris* and faulty word-division, followed by *Verschlimmbesserung* as a scribe excogitated an adjective to agree with *amore* and parallel *novae* in sense.

Tro 337–38

The view in *KK* that Pyrrhus' reply makes no sense with the transmitted reading *exsolvit* shows that, as at 246, Zw. is expecting literal accuracy from Pyrrhus, where we should expect tendentious misrepresentation (cf. 329, where Pyrrhus claims that his slaughter of Priam was a mercy killing). On literal vs. rhetorical criteria, see the Index under 'text criticism.' Here Pyrrhus implies that by killing Priam he ended the war, and with it the warrant for Agamemnon's

---

[14] Bannier's defence of the paradosis in *RhM* 73 (1920) 81–82 and Wertis' reply ad loc. both mis-define the construction as ellipse of *amore* with *veneris*, i.e. "amore subito ac veneris novae (sc. amore)." There is no ellipse, but a single noun and concept with two modifiers.

[15] As an alternative to the hypothesis of a lacuna, Gronovius suggests that everything from *ac* to *feres* be taken together (*veneris novae* now depending on *spolia*), the gist being "rapies e domo nostra puellas quas . . . deperire coepisti?" Again the unusual postponement of *-ne* is a stumbling-block (so Keulen).

panhellenic authority: consequently the Greeks have both the memory of Agamemnon's tyranny, and the present freedom to scoff at the hollowness of his new views. The argument is muddled by Axelson's conjecture *exsolvet*, which subordinates the Greeks' *present* ability to see through Agamemnon to a *future* action by Pyrrhus.

***Tro* 341**

Metre and content combine to identify this line as inauthentic. Metrically the required scansion *tr(eī)* is unique in STrag in two respects.[16] First, Greek proper names in *-eus* in STrag regularly have disyllabic genitive endings in - (short e and long i),[17] with no parallel for reduction of this ending to a monosyllable by synizesis. Second, a combination of two vowels by synizesis is nowhere else elided before another vowel. (At *Thy* 520 the scansion is *fĭd (i) accipe*.)

The content of 341 has no credible connection with *nempe cognati maris* but simply reverts to the point already made in *scelere quae fratrum caret*, with a clumsiness particularly evident after the skilful verbal parrying of 339b and 340b (so Friedrich 1933 146f.).[18] In itself line 341 would be better placed after *scelere quae fratrum caret* as an immediate amplification (cf. *Ag* 994b–95), but it would there disrupt the close grammatical connection between *hos Scyros animos* and *inclusa fluctu*. Deletion is therefore required. Friedrich persuasively suggests that an explanatory gloss on *fratrum*, viz. *Atrei et Thyestae*, was later expanded into a full line. Other interpolations adding proper names for clarification are *Med* 666 and *Pha* 1106–07.

***Tro* 349–59**

This note seconds my earlier interpretation of Agamemnon's decision to consult Calchas (1985 438–40). I argued that the decision

---

[16] The alternative scansion *tr (i)* suggested by Zw. *Proleg.* 210 is ruled out by the fact that the first syllable of this name is always long elsewhere in STrag, and indeed (as Zw. himself shows ibid. fn. 154) wherever its quantity can be determined in Latin poetry.

[17] *Aegei Pha* 563, *Pelei Tro* 247 (scansion uncertain at *Ag* 615), *Promethei Med* 709, *Thesei Pha* 645, 646.

[18] Fantham followed by Zw. argues that "Pyrrhus must do more than defend himself, and 340 gives only defense: 341 is the required counterattack." But this counterattack has already been made in 339b, and Pyrrhus is satisfied with defence in 344–46 and 348. The connection of thought between Agamemnon's speeches at 340a and 342f. is clear: it was when brought to Scyros that Achilles had the opportunity to seduce Deidamia and so father Pyrrhus.

represents a climb-down on Agamemnon's part, since he cannot doubt that Calchas will ratify the human sacrifice which he has been opposing. Here I would add that it is characteristic of Senecan dramaturgy for a lengthy and apparently irresolvable argument to be resolved quite suddenly with the yielding of one party: compare *Herc* 1313ff., *Pha* 250ff., *Ag* 306–09, *Thy* 487–89. The abruptness of these concessions by Senecan interlocutors does not make them incomprehensible in terms of human character and motivation. In fact Sen.'s audience would recognise it as characteristic of Agamemnon first to take a strong stand and later to back down from it: he did so over the issues of sacrificing Iphigenia (Aesch. *Ag*, Eur. *IA*), of taking Briseis from Achilles (*Iliad* 1–9), of Ajax' burial (Soph. *Ajax*), and of entering his home over purple cloths (Aesch. *Ag*).[19]

Tro 352

A has *poscunt*, E *poscent*. It is more likely that an original present has been altered to a future, through assimilation to the tense of *dabo*, than vice versa. *Poscunt* could be a true present, or could refer to the imminent future (viz. "if the Fates, through their spokesman Calchas, demand her," cf. *Pha* 596, *Thy* 324 and my comm. on *Herc* 1284): in this context the distinction is immaterial.

Tro 424

To retain the EA reading *dira*, rather than correcting it to *dura* with Bentley, would show an unfounded faith in the reliability of scribes, who do in fact repeatedly confuse these two adjectives. The neuter plural *dura* is used substantivally by Sen. with unusual frequency (*TLL* 5.1.2307.19–41), and is contrasted to *laeta* at *Oed* 208 and to *secunda* at *Const. Sap.* 5.5, as here to *prosperis rebus*. *Dira* is nowhere else substantival in Sen., and when so used by other writers, it almost always refers to terrible things *spoken* (*TLL* 5.1.1274.14–21).[20]

---

[19] Consequently I cannot accept the view that there is a kind of disjunction between the moral debate and Calchas' proclamation of "fate," with the verdict of fate rendering the moral debate "utterly redundant" (Wilson 1983 31), "irrelevant to what transpires" (Boyle 1994 23). On the contrary, Agamemnon's policy of humane clemency is surely superior to Calchas' retrogressive mumbo-jumbo, for Sen. and for almost any reader ancient or modern; it is only Agamemnon's failure of nerve that gives Calchas his chance.

[20] Keulen regards *dira* as "very appropriate here, announcing her dream." This speech, however, notably does not announce her dream, but describes her state of mind since Hector's death.

***Tro* 430**

Obscuri specus is usually taken as plural nominative (cf. 178), in which case *laxantur* is used in a slightly different sense with *specus* than with *claustra* (respectively *OLD* 2 and 3). Keulen prefers to take the phrase as singular genitive, which strikes me as less characteristic of Senecan style. I found no example in *Tro* of two genitive *phrases* dependent on the same noun; the closest is 917f. *causa bellorum fui/ tantaeque Teucris cladis?*[21]

***Tro* 504**

The correction of *-que* to *-ne* by Richter (1894 8) clarifies the function of *turpes* as a predicative adjective, i.e. denoting Astyanax' attitude. By separating the two questions, the correction also makes better sense of each of them: "Why do you shrink back? Do you despise concealment as base?" Corruption of *-ve* to *-que* is not uncommon (see note on *Thy* 688); *-ne*, paleographically similar to *-ve*, is usually protected from that corruption by sense and syntax,[22] but here the protection is less strong.

***Tro* 541**

On the sense of *stetit* see below on *HO* 123.

***Tro* 578**

At 1986 271–72 I gave reasons for replacing the transmitted *morte* with *cruce*. Since the cross is a Roman and therefore anachronistic element, I should add that such elements occur frequently in Senecan drama: a very partial list from three plays would include *Herc* 48 *opima*, 164–66 (*salutatio*), 172 *fori*, 339 *titulis*, 348 *novitas* (i.e. the status of *novus homo*), 581 *iuridici*, 738 *plebeia*, 918 *tura*, *Tro* 150–55 (triumph), 773 *sub tuum mittes iugum*, 778 *Troici lusus*, 782 (Salii: v. Fantham ad. loc. and Boyle on 766–82), 1133 *pronuba, Pha* 167 *Getae*, 497f. (gilded beams), 499f. (*mola salsa*), 535 *ballista*, 816 *Parthico*, 983 *fasces*.

---

[21] Also 304 if Bentley's conjecture is accepted (*amoris aestu . . . ac veneris novae*). Less similar instances of two genitives dependent on one noun: 129, 526, 569, 896, 1076.

[22] Zw. in *KK* speaks of the "frequent interchange" of *-ne* and *-que* in the MSS, but this is incorrect, and his citation of Housman *Classical Papers* 1077, as if in support, is tendentious: what Housman says is, "there are places . . . where *que* . . . has been corrupted into *ne* [not vice versa]; but naturally there are not many." Two such places in Sen. are *Phoen* 162 and *Thy* 320 in A.

An alternative conjecture is *chalybe* (Delz 1989² 506), which would refer in a vague but threatening way to metal instruments such as the sword and chains. Andromache will then pick up Ulysses' word *chalybe* with *ferrum* (584), as she picks up his *igni* and *cruciatu* with *flammas* and *diras mali doloris artes* respectively (582f.). But *chalybs* is a picturesque and poetic word, which might be thought out of place in a blunt and brutal speech.

In defence of *morte* it is argued that *morte cruciatu* form "a collective phrase" (Fantham) or a hendiadys (*KK*), viz. 'execution-with-torture.' But when these nouns are joined in this way, they are usually linked by a copula (examples in Jocelyn, *Tragedies of Ennius*, p. 193 fn. 6). Here the absence of a copula, combined with the presence of other items in the asyndetic list, works against taking *morte cruciatu* as a single separate item. In any case the addition of *morte* to *cruciatu* is superfluous, since it is the *cruciatus* which will extract Andromache's secret, and *mors* adds nothing in that respect, especially as Andromache has just welcomed the prospect of death.

Tro 584[b]–85[a]

Ferrum has variously been taken to refer here to chains, a sword, or heated metal used in torture. Since the rest of the phrase is inconclusive, the context needs to be taken into account in choosing between these three possibilities. Andromache first (in 582–83[a]) defies 'active' tortures such as Ulysses threatened in 578. Then from *famem* to *luem* she adds slower-acting 'passive' tortures associated with imprisonment. Chains fit well into this context, whereas the sword or heated metal would merely revert to the *vulnera* and *diras doloris artes* of 582–83[a].

Linguistic support for chains comes from *inditum*, since as Fantham points out *indo* is a *vox propria* for fastening chains onto the body (*OLD* s.v. 1c): a rare word in poetry, it is perhaps used here for this specifying purpose. For chains as one of the afflictions used to extract secrets cf. 559–60, and for *ferrum* = 'chains' in such a context cf. *Pha* 882–84 *verbere ac vinclis anus/altrixque prodet quidquid haec fari abnuit./vincite ferro*. The *viscera* are usually what lies *below* the skin, but here the word *visceribus* is used emotively of the surface of the flesh to suggest its vulnerability, rather as at Cic. *Tusc*. 2.20 *cui* (sc. *Herculi*) *cum Deianira sanguine Centauri tinctam tunicam induisset inhaesissetque ea visceribus*. The best reading in the following word will be *ustis* (A), taken proleptically in the sense 'galled, chafed,' since that word in

that sense strengthens the prospect of suffering, just as *secantibus* does in 560.

The use of *ferrum* in conjunction with *viscera* led many readers to take the phrase to mean "the sword thrust deep within these vitals" (Miller). As I showed at 1986 272–73, *istis* could carry the sense 'these of mine,' but it is unlikely that *inditum* could convey the required meaning 'thrust into.' The A reading *ustis,* if taken in the sense 'charred, burnt,' might suggest a reference to heated metal, but it seems insufficient to specify such a reference by itself, in the absence of linguistic support from the context. As I argued ibid., fn. 4, one would expect clarification by an epithet for *ferrum*, such as *ardenti* in Juvenal 14.21f. *aliquis tortore vocato/uritur ardenti . . . ferro.*

Tro 586

See my argument for *timens* at *CP* 84 (1989) 242. The phrase *iratus tumens* would be unclear. One might assume the familiar association of *tumere* and its cognates with arrogance, cf. *Herc* 68, 384, *Tro* 264, 301, *Med* 178, *Pha* 137, *Thy* 609. The juxtaposition with *iratus*, however, suggests the association of such words with anger; yet one would expect *ira tumens* (cf. *Phoen* 352, *Thy* 737) for "swelling with anger," rather than *iratus tumens.*

Tro 589–93

The point about the 10-year war (591) is that it demonstrates Troy's power of resistance, and therefore the likelihood of renewed war so long as any rallying-point survives for the Trojans (so Fantham). Ulysses made just this point earlier, *bella post hiemes decem/totidemque messes iam senex miles timet/aliasque clades rursus ac numquam bene/Troiam iacentem* (547–50). But the traditional punctuation, which attaches 591 to 592–93, can only create a different and less effective point, namely that after 10 years Ulysses himself is inured to protracted warfare, but does not want Telemachus involved in it. The period should therefore be placed at the end of 591, not of 590.

Tro 664

For my proposal to replace *e* with *a*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 304. Smith 2002 accepts my interpretation of *traham sepulcra* as "tear apart the burial place," but takes *e summo* to mean "from top [to bottom]" rather than "starting from the top." This is persuasive in view of Ulysses' emphasis on complete destruction, 639 *totus*, 663 *funditus*,

685 *funditus*. In phrases meaning "from bottom [to top]" *ab* and *ex* are interchangeable, cf. V. *Aen.* 2.625 *ex imo verti Neptunia Troia*, 2.810 *vertere ab imo . . . moenia Troiae*; Sen. *Med* 981 *vertite ex imo domum*, *Phoen* 345 *ab imo tota considat domus*, *Pha* 562 *versa* ab *imo regna*, *Thy* 1010 *tota ab imo tecta convellens solo*. There is no parallel for *ex* in phrases meaning "from top [to bottom]," *pace* Smith; contrast V. *Aen.* 2.290 *ruit alto a culmine Troia*, 2.603 *sternitque a culmine Troiam*. But the usage is not improbable by analogy: I am therefore inclined to withdraw my conjecture.

Tro 770

The MSS reading *medios* is clearly wrong, and Garrod's *melius* equally clearly restores the right reading, contrasting the crazy prayer for military glory with the better prayer for long life: see my discussion 1989 247. If *medios* is retained, there is no such contrast between the two prayers, and *demens* (768) will have to apply to both. Elsewhere in STrag, however, *demens* is naturally enough used not of prayers, hopes, plans etc. which *turn out* to be fruitless (that aspect is already covered here by *spes vana*), but of those which are crazy *in themselves*: Hercules' ambition to storm the heavens, Phaedra's hope to seduce Hippolytus, Medea's thought of killing her children, Oedipus' neurotic prayer for death, Icarus' goal of reaching the stars (respectively *Herc* 975, *Pha* 1193, *Med* 930, *Oed* 103, 893). There was nothing crazy in this way about Andromache's prayer for 'years' (*annos*) for her son, but in contrast her prayer for military glory like Hector's was crazy because such glory is not a recipe for 'years,' as the instances of Achilles and of Hector himself show. *Melius* supplies the required contrast; the pair *demens/melius* is similarly used to contrast crazy with sensible plans at *Med* 930.

Tro 781

The transmitted *revocante* will mean 'reviving' (*OLD* 12), and is comparable to *referens* above. Keulen suggests that "the verb seems the more appropriate because of the *vox* of musical instruments." One would be happier about the sense 'reviving' if the adjective describing *modos* meant something like 'traditional.'

Hemsterhuis' conjecture *reboante* gives a *mot juste*.

1. It is used of the blare of a trumpet at Lucr. 4.546 *et reboat raucum retro cita barbara bombum*, where the accusative *bombum* parallels

modos here. Lucretius' *barbara* gives a link with *barbarica* here, though not identical in meaning.
2. In that Lucretian line, *reboat* is corrupted in OQ to *revorat*, which shows that *revocante* here could disguise an original *reboante*.
3. *Reboo* is used of Phrygian music at Cat. 63.20–22 *Phrygiam ad domum Cybebes, Phrygia ad nemora deae,/ubi cymbalum sonat vox, ubi tympana reboant,/tibicen ubi canit Phryx.*

Though *revocante* can be defended (Keulen), *reboante* is so appropriate, and the likelihood of its corruption so great, that I am inclined to adopt it.

Farnaby followed by Keulen identifies Sen.'s *flexo . . . cornu* as the Berecynthian *tibia curva*, for which cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.18.13f. *cum Berecyntio/cornu* with Nisbet & Hubbard ad loc. But in view of Ov. *Met.* 1.98 *aeris cornua flexi*, one may doubt if the reference is so specific.

Tro 783

Cf. *Herc* 706 *ipsaque morte peior est mortis locus*, *Oed* 180f. *o dira novi facies leti,/gravior leto, Thy* 572 *peior est bello timor ipse belli.* These parallels decisively defend *morte* against Peiper's conjecture *Marte*. They also highlight the fact that here Sen. has chosen not to repeat the same noun, as he could have done by ending the line *mortis genus*. This suggests that *mors* and *letum* are not synonyms here. That Astyanax is to die at all (*mors*) is terrible, but the manner of his violent death (*letum*) is worse.

Tro 787–88

E has *lacrimas* in 787 and *paucas* in agreement with it in 788; A has *lacrimis* in 787 and *parvos* in 788, agreeing with *oculos*. *Parvos* has appeared suspect to most modern critics, and was decisively dismissed by Wertis ad loc. and by Zw. *Rez.* 195–96. The natural conclusion is that E preserves the original text of the lines, while A has accommodated *lacrimas* to the syntax of the rest of line 787, and then replaced *paucas* with its usual inventiveness. But editors have not in fact accepted E in full. Their objection is presumably (though I have nowhere seen it stated) that E's parenthetic construction requires modern punctuation to make it immediately clear, viz. *Lacrimas, Ulixe—parva quam petimus mora est—concede paucas*. But ancient texts are intended to be understood through the ear, not the eye, and the actor or *recitator* would mark the parenthesis with his voice. The

accusative noun *lacrimas* would be held in the mind until the listener heard the verb governing it, viz. *concede*: cf. *Pha* 35ff. *at Spartanos (genus est audax avidumque ferae) nodo cautus propiore liga.*

Leo, followed by most later editors, printed a hybrid text, *Lacrimis, Ulixe, parva quam petimus mora est; concede paucas*, e.q.s. The use of *paucas* here is as ugly as its equivalent would be in English, "For tears, Ulysses, the respite I ask is small; grant a few, so that with my own hand I may close . . ."! This version also raises the sardonic question why Andromache needs *tears* to close her son's eyes, whereas in E's text 'tears' and 'time' are closely associated, so the question does not arise. (A better solution, if it were thought necessary to accept *lacrimis* in 787, would be to accept Richter's *patiens* in 788, cf. 694f. *preces placidus pias/patiensque recipe*, and of tolerating an unwelcome plea also *Herc* 361 *aure verba patienti excipe*.)

Tro 820

For the transposition of this line before 836, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 296f.

Tro 837

What Chalcis pushes against is not the land but the sea, since it constricts the Euripus to its narrowest point, causing powerful tidal flows. Similarly what Sunion encroaches on at *Pha* 25f. *curvati litora ponti/Sunion urget* is the Aegean. *Litus* therefore refers to the edge of the sea rather than of the land in these two places: for the usage v. *KK* on *Med* 35, and cf. the occasional use of *ripa* for the water of streams and rivers (note below on *Oed* 468).

Tro 844

The text as transmitted is defective, since we need either a transitive verb or a verb of motion to explain the construction of the accusatives *Salamina, Calydona* etc. Suspicion has often fallen on *veri*, but although (or rather because) it is cryptic, it has the ring of truth. Both Salamis and its hero Ajax have namesakes, respectively Salamis in Cyprus and Ajax son of Oileus. As Horace can call the Cyprian Salamis *ambiguam* (*Carm.* 1.7.29) in comparison with the 'proper' Salamis, so Ajax the Less is regarded as secondary in comparison with 'the' Ajax, cf. Hom. *Il.* 2.528f., Stat. *Ach.* 1.501 *magno genitus Telamone Aiaxque secundus*. Telamonian Ajax is superior (*Ag* 210 *melior Aiax*), and indeed the 'true' Ajax, by virtue of those qualities which make his name a byword for old-style heroism, particularly in comparison with

the brutishness of Locrian Ajax' rape of Cassandra, mentioned at lines 45–46 (see my note there); that rape gives the Trojan women a special reason for disparaging the Locrian. For *verus* used of one whose actions match his name cf. Cic. *Verr.* 4.147 *facile esse perspicuum quantum inter hunc et illum Numidicum, verum et germanum Metellum, interesset*, V. Fl. 4.327 *salve vera Iovis . . . proles* (of Pollux after defeating Amycus).[23]

Furthermore, Ajax is the only Greek leader named in the whole ode. His name is not given to identify the place: Salamis is hardly obscure, and the other Salamis, as yet unfounded, is not in consideration. Rather the name is present to make a point, as it does with the reading *veri*. In fact Sen. rarely uses a proper name solely for identification, but usually in some such 'loaded' way.[24]

Since 844 is correct in itself, we must conclude with Scaliger that some words including the required verb have been lost before 844. Indeed, 844 implies a preceding reference, now lost, to the territory of Locrian Ajax, which will give point to the phrase "of the true Ajax." In view of Sen.'s reworking of the Catalogue of Ships in this ode, the place(s) mentioned probably came from the list of the Locrians at *Iliad* 2.527–35, a list that also provided Sen. with Bessa and Scarphe in 848.

Here metre must be considered. Where Sen. uses adonii to punctuate runs of sapphics, he thereby creates stanzas either of regular length (*Med* 607–69, 7 3 followed by 7 8) or of irregular length (*Oed* 110–53, 13, 8, 11; *Pha* 736–52, 4, 11). The present ode falls into the second category, since the first stanza has 10 sapphics (with line 820 transposed out) while the second has 9. But there are then at least 17 sapphics (including 820 and at least one lost line) before the adonius of 850. Since there is no parallel for a stanza of this length, the likelihood must be that the lacuna before 844 included an adonius. There must also have been at least one preceding line which the adonius completed grammatically; and at least one line between the adonius and 844, but probably two or more to give a substantial stanza.

---

[23] Another aspect of 'the true Aiax' is that his name contains a 'true meaning' (ἔτυμον) about his woes, Soph. *Aj.* 43ff. (for a similar etymologising reference to a Greek name one need look no further than 818 *lapidosa Trachin*.)

[24] This consideration seems to me to eliminate proposals to replace *veri* with a verb, e.g. *visam* (Jortin).

***Tro* 849**

Though *Iovis* could be said to qualify both *Pisas* and *coronis*, it is perhaps better taken with the latter in view of the rhythm of the line (so Keulen) and the parallel at *Ag* 938 *palma Pisaei Iovis*. Postponement of *et* is less uncommon in lyric than in trimeters (see above on *Herc* 233).

***Tro* 878**

The honorific pattern of *decus* followed by a relative clause is familiar in addresses and prayers (*Herc* 592–94, *Tro* 766–70, *Pha* 410f., *Oed* 250–52), but it can be used with *decus* nom. rather than voc., as *HO* 749f. shows, and Helen uses it here in recommending Pyrrhus. Line 878 should therefore be transposed after 876 with Swoboda and Zwierlein (*pace* Fantham and Keulen).

***Tro* 916**

See *CP* 84 (1989) 248 on punctuation.

***Tro* 922**

The meaning of the brain-teasing phrase *ignosce Paridi* is illuminated by *HO* 983 *ignosce Fatis*. There, after Deianira plans to punish herself for causing Hercules' death, her son replies, "Forgive the Fates:" the implication is that the Fates are the cause, but can easily be forgiven as impersonal. So Helen's phrase "forgive Paris" implies that Paris is the cause, but can be forgiven because Pallas gave Helen to him (921)—and, of course, because he is a Trojan. Both in the wording of 920–21 and in *ignosce Paridi* Helen shifts the blame from herself, but at the same time skilfully avoids blaming Paris, because she claims to be loyal to his memory (908f.) and is addressing his sister-in-law.[25]

The phrase is elliptical and startling, and reminiscent in these respects of many phrases in the *Controversiae* collected by Sen.'s father,[26]

---

[25] I would not want to represent Helen as implying bluntly that Paris is "der Schuldige" (Carlsson 1929 61), "the guilty one" (Wertis 138). The purpose of her phrase, as of Hyllus' phrase, is to dispel blame, not assign it.

[26] So G. Petrone, *QUCC* 48 (1994) 138f. It is difficult to cite examples briefly as they depend on context, but cf. e.g. 7.2.12 *excogitavi quomodo Cicero sua manu periret* (because Cicero defended Popillius who later killed him), 1.5.9 *gratulor vobis, virgines, quod citius illuxit* (the case of the man who committed two rapes in one night).

as befits a casuistical and legalistic speech. Objections to the paradosis are based on far too inflexible and literal a reading. Leo 1.122, for example, complains that the Trojans are not accusing Paris [and therefore cannot be asked to forgive him].

The relationship of 922[a] to the following sentences also deserves thought. The phrase *iudicem iratum*, given emphasis by the word-order of 922[b]–93[a], picks up 906 *iudice infesto* which refers to Andromache (as is shown by 907[a]). The thinking of 922[b]–23[a], then, is as follows; "If you believe that I deserve a hostile judge—a role you have played yourself—be assured that I shall appear before one."[27] (The future participle conveys certainty, as e.g. at 494, *Ag* 828.) So 922[b]–23[a] is not designed to make a contrast between Paris' case and Helen's own: rather with the striking phrase "forgive Paris" Helen concludes the substance of her defence, and in 922[b] reverts by ring-composition to the issue which preceded the defence, viz. the prejudice of the judge (906). Of course the situation creates a general contrast between 922[a] and 922[b]–23[a], viz. that Paris will easily be forgiven while Helen will face a hostile judge, but this is not Helen's chief point.[28]

Tro 932

See Fantham ad loc. (but Sen. does use *altum* substantivally of the sea, e.g. *Tro* 202, 1046) and Fitch 1989 238 fn. 8.

Tro 959

The use of *totus* in conjunction with *dividere* is parallelled at *Thy* 101 *furorem divide in totam domum* and *NQ* 5.18.2 *ut per totum orbem pluviae dividi possint*. There is no need, therefore, for Leo's conjecture

[27] Then *ista Menelaum manent arbitria* overtly names the angry judge, but covertly indicates that further discussion here is pointless; *ista* perhaps has its *tu*-reference, i.e. "the judgment which you have arrogated." My understanding of 922–24[a] agrees largely with Delrius, whose note runs in part, "Quid te iudicem esse postulas? an vereris ne benevolo judice absolvar? non est quod metuas. idem mihi judex, qui laesus, maritus adulterio lacessitus, Menelaus."

[28] Objectors to the paradosis replace *Paridi* with a word referring to Helen herself (*raptae* Schrader, *praedae* Leo, *captae* "beispielweise" Zw.). In addition to other considerations, however, this move obscures the relationship of 922[a] to 922[b]–23[a]. The relationship might be, "You at least could forgive me, though my next judge will be more hostile," but this would require either *tu quidem* or a comparative adjective. Anyway, what is the point of Andromache forgiving Helen, if her case is to be judged by someone else?

tantum.[29] The repetition of *totus* in 962 perhaps creates a poignant contrast between the former and present size of Hecuba's "whole" brood.

Tro 965–68

On the transposition of 967–68 after 978 (Richter) and my attribution of 965[b]–66 to Andromache, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 297f.

Tro 985[b]–86[a]

See Fantham ad loc. for arguments in support of Peiper's deletion.

Tro 994–96

Line 996 has no grammatical construction: Giardina's ruse of placing parentheses around 994[b]–95, to allow 996 to stand in apposition to *mea fata*, is a mere sleight of punctuation, for the *content* of 994[b]–95 is not parenthetic, but specifies how Hecuba's fate will follow her. Nor does the content of 996 fit the context well. Just as Sen. alludes in 992 to the fact that Hecuba will not die in Ithaca, and in 1006 to the great storm which will punish the sacrilegious Greeks, so one would expect 996 to allude to something that will befall Ulysses. *Bella* can refer to all manner of struggles and conflicts (e.g. *Herc* 211, 527), but *ignes*, which is more specific, does not seem to refer to anything in Ulysses' future.

Line 996 must therefore be excised. But it is not evident that excision cures the passage. The stormy seas of 994[b]–95 could exemplify Hecuba's fate if generalised as 'danger and destruction,' but one would expect something more specific also, e.g. hostile gods, lost companions or lost country. I therefore accept Leo's suggestion of a lacuna after 995. (My reasons, however, are somewhat different from Leo's, since he retained 996 and thought the missing verse provided a construction for it, as is shown by his *exempli gratia* supplement <*sociosque merget, obruent reducem quoque*>.)

Tro 997

A's *venient* may be ruled out, since *dum*-clauses with a future indicative have a specific temporal meaning in STrag, viz. 'as long as some

---

[29] The combination of *tot* and *tantus* occurs only twice in STrag (*Tro* 229f., *Oed* 603f.), *pace* KK ad loc.

current situation continues,' *Tro* 532, *Med* 401, 404, *Pha* 630, *Oed* 503–07. But use of a present indicative (E *veniunt*) is well parallelled in *dum*-clauses referring to a future event,[30] cf. Ter. *Eun.* 206 *exspectabo dum venit*, Cic. *Att.* 10.3 *ego in Arcano opperior dum ista cognosco*, V. *Ecl.* 9.23 *Tityre, dum redeo. . . . pasce capellas*, Sen. *Tro* 699f. *annosque, dum te recipit, extendat suos/Laerta*, 760–62, *Med* 288f. *largire . . . moram,/dum extrema natis mater infigo oscula*, K-S 210.7a, *TLL* 5.1.2217.1ff. It is therefore unnecessary to introduce a subjunctive *veniant* with recc. (Use of *dum* with subjunctive in the sense 'until,' as distinct from 'provided that,' is limited in STrag to two passages in *Ag*, 194, 800.)

Tro 1002[b]–03

Commentators have generally taken *hic* in 1003[a] to mean *meus*. But the shift of focus to Polyxena in 1003[b] is then abrupt and unprepared. Furthermore, after the ironic point of "unite your Achilles' parents-in-law" it would be uninventive to add just, "kill another old person." There cannot be a contrast between "butcher of old men" and "this [old woman's] blood," for *senes* can be used of groups including both sexes, e.g. *Oed* 53–54. The contrast, then, is between "butcher of the old" and "this [young woman's] blood" (so Steidle 1968 59 fn. 90): Polyxena's blood "befits" Pyrrhus because she is as defenceless as Priam was, and her killing is equally merciless. The generalising plural *senum* is used in contrasting a past instance from which it generalises (Priam) with a present instance *of a different category*: cf. *Herc* 1284 *pavidasque matres* (Megara, contrasted with Hercules himself), *Phoen* 479 *fratrum* (Eteocles, contrasted with Jocasta). This interpretation gives a dramatically effective sequence: at 1000[b] Pyrrhus hesitates momentarily, as he does later at 1154, and Hecuba takes advantage of the moment to taunt him in 1001–02[a]; then with *perge* she ironically encourages him to do what he intends to do anyway (cf. *Tro* 898, *Pha* 173), and scores a new point from that intention in 1003[a].

Trahit (A) or *trahe* (E)? It is conceivable that E has assimilated an indicative *trahit* to the surrounding imperatives; but it is also conceivable that A, taking *hic* wrongly to mean *meus*, and thinking that *trahe* must have Hecuba as its object after the focus on Hecuba in

[30] The English categories 'until' and 'while' are not easily distinguishable in many of these clauses, but *Tro* 699f. is a clear example of 'until.'

1000[b]–03[a], changed *trahe* to *trahit* to refer to Polyxena. The relatively colourless language of the phrase suggests that it is more likely to be commentary (indicative) than ironic encouragement (imperative). The brevity of the commentary *abreptam trahit* is softened by the fact that Hecuba is already talking about Polyxena (cf. *Tro* 954, *Herc* 1200).

Tro 1011f.

The theme of the ode is that the individual feels pain less intensely if among other sufferers than if isolated. The grief and tears of 1011 are those of the individual, and those of 1012 belong to the group; the group 'multiplies' (*frequentat*) the individual's tears by weeping likewise. *OLD*'s placement of this passage under *frequento* 2c, to 'perform in great numbers,' is misleading, since it takes the tears of 1011 as those of the whole group.

Tro 1019–20

A has *removeto* in both 1019 and 1020, while E reads *removete* in both places. Editors since Leo have followed E, but this causes an instant switch from singular imperative (*tolle* 1019) to plural (*removete*) which cannot be explained in terms of change of addressee and is therefore highly questionable.[31] The sequence *tolle . . . removeto*, on the contrary, gives stylish variation between the regular imperative form and the *-to* form, for which cf. Prop. 2.18.3f. *si quid vidisti, semper vidisse negato;/aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega!*, V. *Aen.* 6.95 *tu ne cede malis, sed contra audentior ito.* Imperatives in *-to* often occur in conjunction with future indicatives (here *surgent*), v. K-S 197; for an instance where the *-to* imperative is roughly equivalent to a condition, as here, cf. Plaut. *Merc.* 770 *cras petito, dabitur; nunc abi.* Metrical shortening of final *-o* is common in STrag: for a word of the same metrical shape cf. *Phoen* 96 *aliquando.* There is no certain instance elsewhere in STrag of an imperative in *-to*, but a reading should not be discarded on grounds of rarity alone if it is clearly superior to the alternative.

[31] At *Tro* 79f. *ite* is addressed to the Chorus members, *leva* to Hecuba; at 1002ff. *perge* is addressed to Pyrrhus, but *maculate* to the Greeks in preparation for Hecuba's curse on the whole fleet. At *Ag* 525 *sistite* can be defended along the lines indicated by Tarrant ad loc., but Bentley's *sistito* is attractive.

Tro 1021

As in 1019 and 1020, it appears that a stylish form preserved by A has been regularised by E. A's subjunctive *scindant* connotes the kind or class of people who can afford to plough with a hundred oxen.[32] "A Relative Clause with the Subjunctive is often used to indicate a *characteristic* of the antecedent, especially where the antecedent is otherwise *undefined*" (Allen & Greenough, *New Latin Grammar* §535). The construction is not uncommon in STrag, e.g. *Tro* 61, 308, 979, *Phoen* 274, 328–30, *Med* 252–53, *Thy* 971–72.

Tro 1031–33

Keulen's attempt to revive Leo's rewriting of these lines overlooks Leo's basic motive, viz. to retain a reading of E (*terris*) against one of A (*spargi*) through thick and thin. The doctrine of the codex optimus is long dead, and its results can also be laid to rest.

With A's *spargi*[33] and the otherwise unanimous paradosis, we have the perfectly satisfactory text (from the middle of 1031) *tabulaque litus/naufraga spargi, mare cum coactis/fluctibus Corus prohibet reverti*, viz. "and [has seen] the shore strewn with planks from shipwrecks, as Corus piles up waves and prevents the sea from ebbing." The point of the *cum*-clause is that the incessant waves pile the wreckage up on the beach. For *cogere* of wind driving waves onshore Wertis compared V. *Georg.* 4.419, Sen. *NQ* 6.20.4 (*spiritus*) *eam scilicet partem terrae movet, in quam coactas aquas intulit.* For the phrase *prohibet reverti* cf. *Oed* 365 *prohibens reverti*. Keulen objects to the use of *reverti* of the sea's ebbing, but it is parallelled at Pliny *Nat.* 6.152 *aestuque reverso*. He objects also to the use of singular for plural in *tabula . . . naufraga*, but the usage is, of course, familiar in STrag; though he suggests that Sen. avoids the usage when a plural is metrically possible, there are contrary instances e.g. at *Herc* 528, 880, *Pha* 182.

Keulen prints the following text using E's *terris* (conjectures of Leo and others underlined): *tabulaque latus/naufraga, terris mare dum coactis/fluctibus Corus prohibet, revertit*. He translates, "and who, borne on a

[32] Correctly rendered in Samuel Pordage's translation of 1660: "Men rich in Gold/Remove: Remove *all such that use*/To Cut rich land with a hunder'd ploughs" (my italics).

[33] Since the A reading *spargi* makes good sense and E's *terris* is unsatisfactory, it seems more economical to assume corruption in one MS tradition, viz. E, rather than in both as is necessitated by Giardina's conjecture *sterni*.

plank of a wrecked ship, while Corus by driving the waves together tries to keep the sea from land, returns." This is open to several objections. First, it introduces two unusually placed sense-pauses in two lines, viz. after *naufraga* and *prohibet*. Second, Sen. nowhere else in verse or prose uses an active form of *revertor*. Third, this notion of a stormwind carefully keeping the sea away from the land is surprising. One also wonders how the sailor returned to land on his plank while the waves were being driven *away* from land. Fourth, the hypothesis of multiple corruption implied by this degree of rewriting is inherently improbable.

Tro 1036

A has *et*, E *ac*. Elsewhere in STrag *simul* is twice used in proximity to *atque* (in the pattern *x atque y simul*, *Phoen* 446, and *simul x atque y*, *Phoen* 656) and twice in proximity to *et* (*x simul et y*, *Pha* 276, *x et y simul*, *Ag* 794). Of these *Pha* 276 matches the present phrase in pattern; it is possible that Sen. writes *simul et* to avoid confusion with *simulac* used as a conjunction.

The MSS divide in the same way (*ac* E, *et* A) at *Med* 249, 847, *Pha* 561, *Oed* 567, *Thy* 658. In two of these places *ac* provides useful distinction from nearby items paired by *et* (*Med* 847, *Oed* 567), and at *Pha* 461 *ac* provides variation. The remaining passages offer no criteria for choice: an original *ac* has perhaps been displaced in A by the more common conjunction *et*. (Zw.'s choice of *et* RA at *Med* 249 reflects his view of R as an independent witness to the archetype.)

Tro 1044–46

The transmitted text is *et tuba iussi dare vela nautae/cum simul ventis properante remo/prenderint altum fugietque litus*. Leo saw that *nautae* cannot be a second subject of *solvet* and *sparget* for reasons of sense, and he therefore postulated a lacuna between 1043 and 1044. In this case either the whole of 1044–46 is a subordinate clause governed by the *cum* of 1045, or else *nautae* is an additional subject of a main verb lost in the lacuna.[34] The first of these options is highly improbable,

---

[34] The first option was in Leo's mind, since he supplemented the lacuna with a *cum*-clause which would be co-ordinate with that of 1044–46, viz. <*caede cum pontus fuerit piatus*>. The second option appears to be suggested by Zw. in *KK*.

since in STrag *cum* is postponed by more than two words only in two instances (*Tro* 1040, *Med* 940), in both of which there are special reasons for postponement and *cum* is placed close to the verb for clarity. The second option is logically impossible, since the action of the hypothetical main verb must be chronologically later than that of *prenderint*, yet its subject *nautae* is qualified by *iussi* whose action is chronologically earlier than that of *prenderint*.

The problem, therefore, is not a lacuna but corruption, which is well solved by Richter's transposition of *et* and *cum*, giving *cum tuba iussi dare vela nautae/et simul ventis properante remo/prenderint altum fugietque litus*.[35] *Iussi* here does not stand for *iussi erunt* as some editors suggest, for no instances are cited of omission of auxiliary forms of *esse* in future-perfect verbs—such an ellipse would clearly be confusing—and certainly STrag has no instances of ellipse of auxiliary forms of *esse* in *cum*-clauses. Rather lines 1044 and 1045 contain coordinate participial phrases, based on *iussi* and *properante* respectively and linked by *et*: "when the sailors, bidden by the trumpet to hoist sail, and with oars making speed together with the winds, gain the deep sea . . ." (*Simul* governs the ablative *ventis*, v. *OLD* s.v. *simul* 12.) For this sequence of perfect participle passive with subject, followed by an ablative absolute marking a further action, followed by a finite verb marking the final action, cf. e.g. Livy 21.5.4 *quo metu perculsae minores civitates stipendio imposito imperium accepere*. *Et* links the two participial phrases not only because they are concerned with the same topic, viz. propulsion, but also because 1045 adds something (viz. oarpower) to the windpower implied in 1044, as *simul ventis* shows.[36]

Tro 1062

On the history of interpretation see Traina 1999, who rightly takes *Hecubae* as dative of the person affected, parallel to *mihi* earlier in the line.

---

[35] Anticipated by early translators (perhaps therefore by their Latin texts?): "Anone these playnts and Troyans teares shall quaile,/And here and there the ship them tosse by seas:/*When* trompets sound shal warne to hoyse up sayle,/*And* . . ." (Jasper Heywood 1559, italics mine); "Alas! all we/Anon shall separated be;/And tossed Ships disjoyn our tears,/*When that* the Sayles the Mariners/At Trumpet sound shall hoist; *and* when/With Winds, and hasty oars they from/The flying Shores hast to the Deep" (Samuel Pordage 1660, my italics).

[36] Similarly in *Ag* the departing Greeks use oarpower to supplement sailpower until they reach the open sea, 425, 438.

Tro 1080

Sen.'s rule of avoiding an iambic fifth foot is broken only five times in his tragedies, and then only to accommodate a final quadrisyllabic word. Three of these instances permit the use of Greek proper names (*Tro* 195, *Med* 709, *Thy* 115, cf. ps.-Sen. *HO* 804). The instance at *Med* 512 accommodates the contrastive anaphora *nepotes/nepotibus*. The present instance also has a rhetorical point, viz. to avoid an obtrusive repetition of *fastigio* from 1069 above. (For the principle cf. 284, where the prose word *gladius* avoids repetition of *ensis* 280.) To alter *cacumine* to *fastigio* with Lange followed by Zw. would defeat Sen.'s purpose.

Tro 1098

Leo's correction of EA *superbe* to *superbit* is convincing. Given the content of the simile 1093–96, its apodosis should be concerned with Astyanax' defiance, not his effect on the spectators. Furthermore the pluperfect tense of *moverat* is inexplicable if it is the verb of the apodosis, but explicable if it looks *forward* to the next action, viz. *desiluit*. For this use of the pluperfect in historical narrative when the writer has the following action in view v. K-S p. 139, and cf. e.g. *Tro* 439f., *Phoen* 245 *videram nondum diem*, *Oed* 12, 135; for the combination of a pluperfect with an historic present (*flet*) in such preparatory clauses cf. *Ag* 465f. *nox prima caelum sparserat stellis, iacent/deserta vento vela*.

With Leo's correction, then, the simile and apodosis form a unit ending with *superbit*, and *moverat* begins a new narrative movement leading to Astyanax' death-leap.

Tro 1109

Bentley conjectured *leget*, 'will collect', for MSS *teget*, 'will cover.' Viansino in his app. crit. objects to the conjecture "nescit enim Andromaca Astyanactis artus disiectos esse," and Axelson reported by Zw. 1978 152 fn. 51 raises a similar objection. But the supposition that Astyanax' body has been *dismembered* by the fall is surely mistaken: *iacet/deforme corpus* (1116f.) implies the body is whole though mangled, and that is the case also in the mourning-scene in Eur. *Tro*, which lies, even if at a distance, behind the present passage. In taking up Andromache's word *artus*, the messenger notably does not report (*pace* Viansino) "artus disiectos esse"; rather his rhetorical question 1110^{b}–11^{a} implies that the body is unrecognisable, an implication confirmed by the details of 1111^{b}–16. *Artus* in 1109 and 1111 has

the collective sense 'body' (so rightly Fantham), as e.g. at *Herc* 1317, *Tro* 89, 1177. The phrase *ossa disiecta et gravi elisa casu*, then, is a detail about the body: I take *disiecta* to mean that the bones have been violently dislocated, and *elisa* that they have been crushed and fragmented.

Axelson loc. cit. followed by Fantham takes *teget* as roughly synonymous with *tumuloque tradet*, i.e. 'hide [in the tomb], bury'. But in Eur. *Tro* there is much concern to wrap Astyanax' body for burial in winding-sheets, 1143, 1200, 1212, 1220. So *teget* here probably refers to covering the body in a shroud *before* burial, cf. V. *Aen.* 9.486–89 (Euryalus' mother) *nec te tua funere mater/produxi pressive oculos aut vulnera lavi,/veste tegens tibi quam noctes festina diesque/urgebam.*

Tro 1126

With verbs indicating the breaking-off of delay, such as *solvere* here, the plural *moras* is regularly used: *solvisti Tro* 353f., *solveram Phoen* 246, *rumpe Tro* 681, *Med* 54, *abrumpere Tro* 939, *dimove Med* 587, *amputat Thy* 762.[37] *Ag* 160 *redemit illa classis immotae moras* is a close parallel in language (n.b. *classis*) and situation (Iphigenia). The A reading *moras* is therefore preferable here to E's *moram*, which is no doubt an instance of E's tendency to 'correct' plurals and singulars (see below on *HO* 1038).

Tro 1147

See Zwierlein 1976 188–90 and *KK*, and Fantham and Keulen ad loc. I follow Zwierlein's deletion of the line, on the grounds that the phrase *Pyrrhum antecedit* interrupts the steady focus of lines 1137–48[a] on Polyxena, seen first through the narrator's eyes and then the spectators'. This focus is essentially static and timeless, with onward narrative beginning again at 1148[b]; the movement of *antecedit* is therefore intrusive.

I doubt whether lines 1148[b]–52[a] are intended to indicate an order of arrival at the tomb. Certainly *stetit* derives from Ovid's *utque Neoptolemum stantem ferrumque tenentem/. . . vidit* (*Met.* 13.455f.), but Ovid's continuous participle "standing" has become in Sen. a momentary

[37] The only exceptions occur when *moram* stands by metonymy for a singular person or thing (*Tro* 813 = Astyanax, 1169 = *spiritum*), or is paired grammatically with another singular noun (*Phoen* 458, *Pha* 1101f. *moram/dominumque rumpunt*).

action "took his stand,"[38] viz. in preparation for the sacrifice, with no indication whether he has just reached the tomb or was already waiting there. Nevertheless 1150 *could* be read as meaning that he arrived after Polyxena (so Fantham and Keulen), and the interpolator, taking it so, added *Pyrrhum antecedit* for clarification, and filled out the line from 1153 *omnium mentes ferit.* The unpointed use of the proper name is characteristic of pedantic interpolation, cf. 341, *Med* 666, *Pha* 1106.

Tro 1149

Editus is frequently used of high places, but *TLL* s.v. *edo* cites no instance of its use in this sense of persons. Does EA *editus* here represent a transference of the regular usage, or is it (as Zw. explains) a scribal assimilation of an original *edito* (Scaliger's conjecture) to the case of *iuvenis*? I think the latter more likely.

The word-order *vertice in busti* is parallelled by Keulen from *Thy* 583 *rupe . . . in Aetnae.* I do not see why the qualifying genitive *busti* should rule out a prior qualifying adjective *edito*, as Keulen thinks; *Thy* 1 *inferorum sede ab infausta* is a comparable phrase with qualifying genitive and adjective in converse positions.

Tro 1158f.

OLD s.v. *ut* 8b interprets *ut* plus future participle as expressing "a real intention, sts. w. implication that it was not carried out." The examples cited are similarly from narrative (Livy). Perhaps, then, *ut* here strengthens the subjective aspect of purpose, viz. 'wanting to make,' and qualifies the future participle's suggestion of an actual outcome.[39]

Tro 1160

Et (EA) here qualifies the preceding statement *uterque flevit coetus* by adding further information, as at *Med* 134ff. *funestum impie/quam saepe fudi sanguinem!—et nullum scelus/irata feci: saevit infelix amor.* This qualifying

[38] In the same way the *stantem*, "stationary" of Prop. 4.6.27 becomes an action, *stetit*, "stopped," at *Herc* 15.

[39] Calder in *GRBS* 7 (1966) 53 fn. 121, believing *ut factura* a Graecism perhaps unique in Latin, interpreted it as exactly equivalent to ὡς ποιήσουσα, "intending to make." Westman, quoted by Calder and Keulen, had taken *ut* as = *tamquam* and interpreted *ut factura* as indicating the impression made on the spectators by Polyxena's fall, viz. "as though to make."

usage (*TLL* 5.2.873.81ff.), comparable in force to *et . . . quidem*, is distinct from the adversative use of *et* (ibid., 893.4ff., Summers on Sen. *Ep*. 56.11). Normalisation of *et* to *at* here by recc. should be ignored by editors, as they rightly ignore Carlsson's conjecture *at* at *Med* 135.

Tro 1168[b]–69

These two questions introduce the topics of the rest of the speech, viz mourning (developed in 1170–71[a]) and the elusiveness of death for Hecuba (developed in 1171[b]–77). The questions are about movement and place (*quo, ubi*) because the Greeks are about to sail for home (1165) whereas Hecuba herself is now homeless. Ker objects that Hecuba knows already that she is to sail for Ithaca (1962 49), but lines 991–95 show that she does not expect to reach Ithaca or die there; in any case, the present questions are more concerned with emotion than information. The obstacle (*mora*) to her death which she will "spew out" is her *spiritus*, cf. *Phoen* 44 *spiritum inimicum exspue, Thy* 245 *spiritum inimicum exspuat.* In the context the phrase perhaps also suggests her spewing-out of laments about the belatedness of her death: so Ker, who however takes this as the sole meaning, translating "on whom (or 'on what theme') shall I spew out this complaint of an old woman's prolonged death?"

PHOENISSAE

Phoen 23

The transmitted reading *suum* is perfectly acceptable both stylistically and mythologically. It gives a double paradox: first, one would more usually flee from another's criminal acts than from one's own; second, in fleeing her own crime Ino perpetrated another of her own. Sen. loves to point paradoxes with forms of *suus*, e.g. *Tro* 1130, *Phoen* 14, 134, 135, 627, *Oed* 63 *suaeque circa funus exequiae cadunt*, 718, 754, *Ag* 947.

Ino's flight after detection of her plot against Phrixus' life originally belonged to a different narrative element from her leap to her death as a result of Juno's jealous persecution: on this point, and on extant and reconstructed versions of the myth, see Gantz 177–79. But the two events naturally tended to be combined, i.e. Athamas' rage at Ino for plotting against Phrixus was said to have led both to her flight and to her death-leap; this version is found in the A scholia to *Il.* 7.86 and in Paus. 1.9.1. Even in accounts which do not combine the events in this way, the death-leap is mentioned not far from the Phrixus episode: so Eur. *Ino* (according to Hyg. *Fab.* 4), Apollod. 1.9.1–2 and Hyg. *Fab.* 2. Sen., then, is either combining the flight and death-leap himself for the sake of a pointed juxtaposition, or following a version which already combined them. Gronovius' objection to *suum*, that Ino's death-leap did not result from her own *scelus* but from Juno's persecution, is over-precise, and conjectures based on it are therefore unnecessary.[1]

Phoen 46

The transmitted *omitte poenas languidas longae morae* is untenable, and Grotius' correction *omitte poenae languidas longae moras* clearly justified

[1] Mythological errors do not inspire confidence in discussions of the text. Frank ad loc. calls the heroine Io, and says that Athamas killed Melicertes; Zw. 1966[2] 683 called Ino's husband Actaeon. Zw. ibid. accepted Peiper's conjecture *novum* for *suum*, supporting it from *Oed* 63, where he thought Müller's conjecture *novae* for *suae* "evident richtig." By 1969[2] 767, however, he was calling Müller's conjecture "zweifelhaft," and thereafter he abandoned it.

in style and sense. When a line contains two noun-adjective pairs Sen. likes to interweave them (v. my *Herc* p. 189), particularly if the adjectives are similar in meaning. The sense required is not "drop your punishment" (*omitte poenas*), but "drop the delay in your punishment" (*omitte poenae moras*). Zw., who retains the paradosis, takes *longae morae* as "ein Gen. qualitatis": this gives "discard your sluggish, long-delaying punishment," which scarcely makes sense. If *longae morae* were taken rather as a genitive of definition, we would have "discard the slow punishment consisting of long delay;" elsewhere in *Phoen*, however, *poena* is used of Oedipus' self-blinding or his coming death, but not of the interval between them.

Grotius' correction gives, "drop these idle delays in your overdue punishment." For *longus* of processes that take *too* long see *OLD* s.v. 12 and 14d.

Phoen 79

Vinci mori est means, "to die is to be defeated." Commentators note the apparent inversion in the Latin word-order, but they do not explain that such inversion is a feature of Senecan style: v. Schmidt 1865 12ff. and my comm. on *Herc* 974f. It occurs particularly in comparisons. At 98f. one would translate, "One who hinders a man in haste to die is the equal of one who forces an unwilling man to die," and at 100 "Forbidding a man to die who desires to is like killing him." Similarly *Ben.* 1.13.3 *tam hostium pernicies quam amicorum*, "a scourge of his friends as much as of his enemies," *Ep.* 55.3 *aeque enim offendisse illum quam amasse periculosum fuit*, "for to support him was equally as dangerous as to offend him." So here "to die is [equivalent to] being defeated."

Phoen 85

Vertit (E) fits the pointed sequence of thought from line 80: the existence of such a paragon as Antigone in so impious a house shows that Nature *is* changing her laws; consequently we can expect that rivers will flow upstream etc.[2] A's *vertet* is probably an assimilation to the adjacent *regeret*.

[2] Miller takes *vertit* as perfect, 'has reversed her laws.' But logically, in that case, rivers should already be flowing upstream.

Phoen 100

For defences of the line against excision see Billerbeck *SSU* 127 fn. and Frank ad loc. Billerbeck notes that the sense and neuter gender of *alterum gravius* refer better to an action (100) than they would to a person (98f.) if 100 were removed.

Phoen 112

For the conjecture *accendam*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 304f.

Phoen 117

In view of the rhetorical echo of the construction of 115f., *sint* (A) is needed to parallel *sit* there.

Phoen 134–35

These lines read like a series of phrases rather than a clause. But the beginning of a clause with a new subject in 136 forces us to reinterpret 134–35 as a clause, with "he was" understood. However, ellipse of *fuit/erat* is rare in STrag.[3] And *sui* is rhetorically superfluous in view of *suorum* 135; the juxtaposition of terms of relationship would be sufficient in 134, as in the passages cited by Frank on 134–7. I suspect, therefore, that *sui* has displaced an original *fuit*.

Phoen 137

Zw. *Proleg.* 231f. finds only one instance of postponement of *et* in *Phoen*, and his student Hirschberg is presumably right in identifying this as the instance (ad loc.). But it is no instance: *sibi* is linked with *viro* by contrastive juxtaposition, not by *et; et* goes with *nepotes*, meaning that in one birth Jocasta produced children for her man, but for herself grandchildren *as well* [as children]. On postponement of *et* elsewhere, see above on *Herc* 233.

Phoen 159

The transmitted *corpus* fits the context. Since Oedipus regards himself as wholly guilty (*totus nocens sum* 158) and as not deserving a wound in any specific place (157), he begins by envisaging a comprehensive wound that would open both chest and belly, revealing

---

[3] I know of only three examples, *Med* 604 and *Pha* 117f. and 654.

the heart and the other *viscera*. For *corpus* = *truncus* cf. Ov. *Met.* 12.463f. *membris et corpore Latreus/maximus*, Sen. *Contr.* 2.5.4 *flagellis caeduntur artus, verberibus corpus abrumpitur*; for the alliteration of *corpus* with *cor* see Carlsson 1926 58, and more generally the index of my edition of *Herc* under 'alliteration.' Since the MSS sometimes confuse *pectus* and *corpus*, as at *Herc* 1299 and *Oed* 1052–53 (v. *TLL* 4.999.63ff.), Heinsius' conjecture *effringe pectus* here could be right, but it is by no means necessary.

***Phoen* 162**

I take A's *-ne* to be a corruption of *-ve* (corrected already in μ), which is required here. The topos 'various means of self-punishment' requires *alternatives*: note *aut* 163, *Pha* 259f. *an . . . an*, 1225 *mittarve, Oed* 927–32 (*aut* and *vel* repeated). Editors printed *-ve* here until Leo favoured E's *-que*; similarly at *Med* 718 Leo intruded E's *-que*, even at the cost of rewriting the previous word. There subsequent editors have rightly reverted to A's *dirusve*; here they have followed Leo, for reasons that are unclear.

***Phoen* 176–78**

For the conjecture *haesit*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 305.

***Phoen* 188**

Et (EA) would be an example of adversative *et* (v. above on *Tro* 1160) if the gist were, "I do not ask you to control your inveterate anger—and yet that would become a man of your strength." (Cf. *Ep.* 63.1 *illud, ut non doleas, vix audebo exigere—et esse melius scio.*) But the gist is rather, "I do not ask you to control your inveterate anger; but it *would* become a man of your strength not to be defeated or show fear." This requires a stronger adversative, viz. Richter's *at* (cf. *sed* 77 in a similar context).

***Phoen* 196**

A distinction can be found between *cupiat* and *petat*, viz. mere wishing for death vs. active pursuit of it, but this does not give a strong pair of alternatives in the context. Lipsius' correction of *cupiat* to *fugiat* is convincing because it restores rhetorical point to the following phrase *utrumque timidi est*: as shunning death manifests fear, so does the contrary impulse of seeking it out. The whole passage has philosophical overtones; for the comparison between aversion from

death and desire for it as equally unfitting impulses, cf. *Ep.* 24.22–25 *obiurgat Epicurus non minus eos qui mortem concupiscunt quam eos qui timent . . . in utrumque enim monendi ac firmandi sumus, et ne nimis amemus vitam et ne nimis oderimus . . . vir fortis ac sapiens non fugere debet e vita sed exire; et ante omnia ille quoque vitetur adfectus qui multos occupavit, libido moriendi.*

Gronovius' much-quoted objection to *fugiat* is literal-minded; "non videtur monendus fuisse Oedipus, mortem tali homini fugiendam non esse." The point of *fugiat* is not, of course, to warn Oedipus against shunning death, but to establish a comparison between shunning death and seeking it, in order to claim that the latter impulse is as cowardly as the former. Antigone then concentrates on *desire* for death (*concupivit* 198) because that is the part of the comparison applicable to her father. The transmitted *cupiat* in 196 could have arisen through mechanical error, as Frank suggests; but more probably it is a deliberate alteration (based on *concupivit* 198) by a scribe who misunderstood *fugiat* in the same way that Gronovius did later.

Phoen 236

The question *quid restat mali?* implies "Why continue living, with no more evil left for me to do?" Frank's characterisation of this as "bizarre" misses the element of wit and paradox characteristic of *Phoen*. Another person contemplating suicide might ask *quid restat boni?* (i.e. "What of value does my life still hold?"), as Hercules does implicitly at *Herc* 1259 *cuncta iam amisi bona*; in 237f. Oedipus enumerates the *bona* he has lost, just as Hercules does in *Herc* 1260f. But for Oedipus the idea of good is so remote that he inverts the question. All the apparent *bona* listed in 237f. have produced evil for him.

Phoen 243ff.

"Oedipus' question, *et esse par quae poterit?*, is left dangling, as he moves on to an account of the unfortunate beginnings of his life." This comment by Frank does not fairly represent the complex thought of these lines. The question *et esse par quae poterit?* implies that death is an insufficient punishment. The following *infanti quoque/decreta mors est* explains why: since death was decreed for Oedipus in infancy, some new (*novam* 242) and greater punishment is required to match the commission of his crimes. There is a somewhat similar thought at *Med* 49f. *haec virgo feci . . ./maiora iam me scelera post partus decent*, where there is likewise a desire for a "matching" punishment (*paria* 52). Further, lines 245–53 are not so much an "account" in the

narrative sense, as an emotional and rhetorical revelation of Oedipus' feeling that his life was doomed at its very source—a feeling connected to his irrational and obsessive guilt throughout.

Phoen 259

Oedipus' diction hereabouts contains paradox, extended uses of words and double meanings, as if reflecting in language the tangled relationships of his family. Since *fidem praestare* is a familiar phrase for keeping one's word (*OLD* s.v. *praesto* 11), the first meaning of *praestiti Delphis fidem* is "I kept faith with Delphi," i.e. I carried out what was envisaged for me by the oracle. This meaning already contains paradox, since Oedipus did not make any promises to Delphi; it was the oracle's word, not Oedipus', that was kept. This consideration reveals a second, sardonic meaning in the phrase: "I lent Delphi credibility." (For *praesto* = provide, afford, lend, v. *OLD* s.v. 9).

Phoen 262f.

Zw. rightly adopts Bentley's punctuation of *proloqui . . . nostras* as a rhetorical question. In this speech, where so much is riddling or loaded, a simple expression of shame would seem too straightforward. The case is different at *Oed* 19 *eloqui fatum pudet*, where the surrounding connections of thought are less complex.

Phoen 265

Giardina's app. crit. confirms that EA have *fare*, and that *effare* (printed in most previous editions) is a reading of recc.

Phoen 277

Sacro . . . cruore indicates that the blood is 'holy' because *pietas* forbids its spilling (so Frank), but also that once spilled it is 'accursed' for the same reason. For the latter sense Hirschberg ad loc. cites Hor. *Epod*. 7.17–20 *sic est: acerba fata Romanos agunt/ scelusque fraternae necis,/ ut inmerentis fluxit in terram remi/sacer nepotibus cruor*; add Sen. *Thy* 93f. *ne sacra manus/violate caede* (cited by Zw.).[4]

Phoen 320

For the formal address initiating dialogue and opening with reference to the addressee's high birth cf. *Herc* 359, *Pha* 129, *Ag* 125,

[4] The two senses may be present also at *Ag* 638 *sacros gaudet tangere funes*.

234: these parallels disfavour Leo's suggestion (1.80) that the beginning of the messenger's speech is lost before 320. In those passages the reference is contained in a vocative phrase (e.g. *Ag* 234 *tu, Leda sata*); but here A's *edite* is untenable since it would leave *invocant* without an object. E's *editum*, on the other hand, provides an object but leaves Oedipus unaddressed. In the first printing of the Loeb edition I therefore inserted *te* before *exemplum*, reading *editum* in agreement with this *te*.[5] A parallel for *te* elided at the beginning of the first foot is found at *Pha* 618 (see my note there, and Zw. *Proleg.* 207f. for elision of monosyllables in this position). It is noteworthy that elision of a personal pronoun at the beginning of a foot is much less carefully avoided in *Phoen* than elsewhere in STrag (cf. 6, 207, 443, 488; elsewhere only *Pha* 618, *Ag* 933). Loss of *te* here could have resulted from omission of *t* by a rubricator, or from haplography of *e*.

Second thoughts suggest, however, that the paradosis can be defended. Participles are sometimes found without an accompanying noun or pronoun, *Herc* 515 *regentem*, *Pha* 95 *revulsam, Oed* 300 *depressam*, 560 *obsidentem, Ag* 19 *exustus, Thy* 2 *captantem*; examples in address are *Herc* 359 *trahens* and 623 *editum* (admittedly softened by *nate* in 622). It could be argued that the messenger skilfully distances his honorific address from Oedipus' present plight by omission of the pronoun: not "Thebes calls on you," but "Thebes calls on the man born of royal stock." (For the somewhat impersonal usage cf. below on *Pha* 95 *revulsam*.) Similarly *exemplum in ingens* foregrounds a quite different view of Oedipus from that implicit in his present circumstances.

***Phoen* 356f.**

Baden rightly calls *quod debet* an ellipse for *quod debet fieri*, but he does not explain how this clause relates to those which follow. Pierrot offers the following account, accepted by Miller and Herrmann: "Quin etiam, ut nefas, quod debet fieri, nostro de more fiat, ut fiat nefas, quod meos deceat toros . . ." But what is the sense of the absolute statement that the *nefas* "must" occur? And why, if *quod debet* and *quod meos deceat toros* have the same antecedent (viz. *nefas*),

[5] The possibility of inserting *te* here was raised by Zw. 1978 147 fn. 24, but only to be rejected; Zw. considered the elision unparallelled, since he regarded *Pha* 618 as interpolated.

does Sen. separate these two clauses by an awkward inversion, and make an equally awkward distinction between an indicative and a subjunctive verb? Not so: *ut fiat nefas* is subordinate to *quod debet* as the word-order indicates, and the gist is, "As must happen so there can be an outrage after my style, one appropriate to my marriage-bed . . ."

***Phoen* 358**

For the conjecture *eruet*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 305f.

***Phoen* 374f.**

For the conjecture *qui* for *quod*, in conjunction with Gronovius' *findit* for *cingit*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 306.

***Phoen* 388**

Zw. followed by Frank prefers A's *stetit* to E's *adest*. *Stetit* would mean that the battlelines are stationary, but the whole impression of the passage is one of movement, as the two armies advance and are deployed (note 390 *mota*, 391 *parant*, 392 *subit*, 393 *cursu . . . ruit*). A's penchant for stylistic 'improvement' is no doubt at work here. Zw.'s preference for *stetit* is based on *Oed* 586f. *saeva prosiluit cohors/et stetit in armis omne viperum genus*; but that passage can more accurately be compared with *Herc* 260f., which also concerns the warriors sprung from the dragon's teeth: *e cuius arvis eque fecundo sinu/stricto iuventus orta cum ferro stetit*.

***Phoen* 394–96**

An antecedent noted only by Barchiesi is Aesch. *Sept.* 81–85, where dust raised from the plain by the hooves of cavalry reaches into the sky and announces battle. Eur. *Phoen* 250ff. ἀμφὶ δὲ πτόλιν νέφος/ ἀσπίδων πυκνὸν φλέγει/σῆμα φοινίου μάχας is less similar, since the "cloud" is not the dust of cavalry.

***Phoen* 425**

For mythical traditions which justify the description of Phineus as "cruel" (*pace* Frank ad loc.), since he either blinded his children by Cleopatra or allowed them to be killed, see Gantz 351f.

Phoen 444

Modern editors before Frank printed E's *unam*, but Frank's arguments for A's *una* have persuaded me and Zw.[6] Admittedly Sen. loves to make rhetorical contrasts between one and larger numbers: for *unus* contrasted with *omnis* cf. *Herc* 963, *Tro* 572, *Med* 94, 654, *Pha* 578, *Oed* 937, *HO* 322. But the one/all contrast would be deflated here by the fact that *omnis* is subsequently qualified. Rather the point here is that the warring brothers and their armies are to divert (*vertite* 443) their aggression from each other, and find common cause in attacking Jocasta.

Phoen 447

Axelson convincingly identifies the line as an interpolation. The motive for its insertion was not so much to clarify *ex quo* (450), as to make further use of the pithy saying "strike this belly because of its offspring" (or potential offspring), for which cf. Sen. Rhet. *Contr.* 2.5.7, Sen. *Oed* 1038f., ps.-Sen. *HO* 991f., *Oct* 369f., Tac. *Ann.* 14.8.5, Dio Cass. 62.13.5. An interpolator may expand a text "simply because it allows for further elaboration" (Tarrant 1989 137): see index under 'interpolation, collaborative.'

Phoen 448

Membra is qualified by *haec* in E, by *mea* in A. *Uter in alterum abiturus erat?* Clearly explanatory alteration of *haec* to *mea* is more probable than the reverse alteration.

Phoen 456

Frank rightly describes Avantius' conjecture *donate matrem pace* as "unobjectionable as far as sense, usage and context are concerned." But in STrag this is condemnation, not commendation. Gronovius's brilliant correction *donate matri bella* has exactly the pointed quality which Sen. prizes, and which is likely to puzzle scribes into altering the text.

Phoen 530

Sub ictu means 'within range' of a missile or weapon, *OLD* s.v. *ictus* 1b. Sen. likes the metaphorical use of the phrase (*TLL* 7.1.171.57–65).

[6] Frank's arguments in *CQ* 42 (1992) 284 are repeated verbatim in her commentary. For Zw. see p. xiii of the 1993 printing of the OCT.

Here the metaphor is particularly effective because of the fact that the brothers are physically within striking distance of each other.

Phoen 552

The transmitted *genetrixque vidit*, with its third-person self-reference, fits Jocasta's focus here on the witness of the whole community and family of which she is a member. Since *vidit* is in enumerative anaphora from 543–545–551, the emphasis falls on *genetrix*, i.e. on Jocasta's familial status, and this gives point to the following *nam*: "your mother saw it [alone of your parents], for your father (no thanks to his sons) could not watch it." For such self-reference using a term of relationship cf. e.g. 93, 106, 121, *Pha* 1264, *Thy* 1040 (the last two adduced by Zw.); for similar self-reference with a proper name, e.g. *Phoen* 89f., 313–19, *Med* 8, 166, 517, 524, 567, 934.

The alteration of *vidit* to *vidi* by recc. inappropriately throws emphasis on Jocasta's individual experience, and so disrupts the point of *nam*. The alteration assimilates the present lines to 528–35, where Jocasta does speak of her personal witness and feelings in the first person. But thereafter she broadens the reference to include sisters, father and city (536ff.). For scribes' tendency to alter third-person self-references, see below on *Pha* 1178.

Phoen 566–74

Jocasta envisages Polynices' impious actions in two stages: (1) attacking the sacrosanct walls during the siege, (2) carrying off spoils and captives after victory. Frank on 571f., following Gronovius, prefers to punctuate after *victor* rather than before it, giving *haec saxa franges victor?* We now have two separate questions about the walls: (1) will you attack them in the siege? (566f.), (2) will you smash them in the sack following your victory? But the chief point in 566–70 is the sacrilege involved in damaging the miraculous walls at all, and it seems overnice to divide this particular sacrilege into two stages.

Phoen 571–74

The punctuation of modern editions attaches 572 to 571 as a second object of *auferes*. This way of construing 572 is a survival from the old vulgate, which had *matres* (not *matresque*) at the beginning of 573, and therefore necessarily placed a question-mark at the end of 572. But once the correct *matresque* (E) is read at the beginning of 573, it becomes clear that 572 is best construed as a first object

of *trahet* (574). A comma should therefore be placed at the end of 571, not of 572.

The reading *vinctosque* (ET) in 572 now anticipates *catena . . . imposita* (574) in an awkward way, since chains are first attributed to one group, the *duces*, and then to both *duces* and *matres*. *Vinctosque* also anticipates *vincta* in 577. I am therefore inclined to prefer *victosque* (PCS), which plays off *victor* 571 to contrast the differing fates of men who should be united. The participles *victos* and *raptas* now differentiate the captives appropriately as leaders who have suffered defeat and matrons who have suffered seizure. Corruption of *victus* to *vinctus* happens readily (e.g. *HO* 814), but here and at *Herc* 816 it was perhaps influenced by the proximity of chains.

Phoen 591

At *Med* 460 Medea, after rhetorical questions about her prospective life in exile, shifts to statements rhetorically accepting the "command" to leave: *eatur. regius iussit gener:/nihil recuso*. The similarity of that passage to this supports the traditional punctuation of *iubes abire* as a statement rather than a question.

Phoen 603

In defence of the transmitted *iacent*, Frank ad loc. cites passages where *iacere* is used of wide spaces. One may add that *iacere* is used expressively where there is a contrast between relatively level land and nearby hills or mountains (here Mt Tmolus), cf. *Pha* 4f. *quae saxoso loca Parnetho/subiecta iacent,* Luc. 4. 52 *urebant montana nives camposque iacentes/. . . pruinae*, Stat. *Theb*. 2.502–04, Avien. *Orb. Terr.* 984f. *(Phrygiae) Minori/quae iacet immensae late sub rupibus Idae.*

Zw. 1980 189f. conjectured *patent* for *iacent*, and similarly *patens* for *iacens* at *Med* 694 and *patent* for *iacent* at *Pha* 10; he also accepted Schrader's *patent* for *iacent* at *Tro* 120. None of these conjectures is necessary, and that at *Med* 694 was soon demoted from the text to the app. crit. of the OCT.

Phoen 610ff.

On the conjecture *hac* in 614 (Bothe) and 610, and on the interpretation of 610–13, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 306f. That discussion presupposes Bentley's correction in 610 of EA *maris* to *mare*, which provides a grammatical subject. For the resulting phrase *nomen Ionii* with its defining genitive, "name of 'Ionian,'" cf. Vell. 2.27.5 (*Sulla*)

Felicis nomen adsumpsit, Tac. *Hist.* 1.47 *decernitur Othoni . . . nomen Augusti,* also Sen. *Herc* 854 *matris et nomen modo doctus infans.*

***Phoen* 612**

Frank translates, "it [viz. the sea] has presented a shore closer to the east." But presented to whom? And can *latus* really denote the shore of the sea? *TLL* 7.1029.2–10, which Frank cites, is nihil ad rem, since it explicitly concerns *latus* used of lands (not seas), and accompanied by an adjective or genitive naming the land, e.g. *Herc* 376 *Siculum latus.*[7]

Latus dedit is perhaps better understood in a more strongly metaphorical sense. As *tergum/-a dare* means to turn one's back, so *latus dare* can to mean to turn one's side or turn sideways (cf. *Pha* 1073 *ne det obliquum latus*, Val. Fl. 4. 304); the Mediterranean turns aside or laterally, i.e. east, at the south end of the Ionian coast. *Iam propius orienti* is proleptic, indicating the result of the turn; *propius* (Gronovius' correction of EA *propior*) agrees with the subject *mare.*

***Phoen* 648**

Frank ad loc. correctly defends the transmitted reading *Thebano.*

***Phoen* 651^{b}–64**

The MSS are often unreliable in their speaker-attributions. Here EA report the speakers as Polynices and Jocasta, continuing their long dialogue started at 464. But this arrangement is plainly impossible in view of the content of the lines, and no modern editor adheres to it.

Grotius made the cogent proposal, reported and endorsed by Gronovius, that the speakers are Eteocles and Polynices. This gives a dramatic development convincingly similar to the corresponding scene in Eur. *Phoen*, where Jocasta's attempt to pacify the brothers is ended by Eteocles' truculent declaration that he will retain the throne (588–93), followed by an interchange of short speeches between the brothers. In Sen. Eteocles first addresses his mother (651), since

[7] Frank also cites *KK* 128, where Zw. compares V. Fl. 5.165f. *horruit immensum Ponti latus, horruit omnis/Armeniae praetentus Hiber* and Sil. 17.248f. *insequitur sublime ferens nigrantibus alis/abruptum Boreas ponti latus.* But in the first *Ponti* refers to the land of that name, not the sea, since it is coupled with the Iberian land adjacent to Armenia; in the second, an *abruptum latus* is a different matter from a normal *latus.*

she was the last speaker, then turns to his brother with *te* (652); this corresponds to μῆτερ 588 . . . σύ 593 in Eur. The phrase *te turbae exulum/ascribo* reflects a point made repeatedly in the Euripidean dialogue (593, 603, 607, 610, 627);[8] Sen. characteristically turns it to rhetorical advantage, to contrast Eteocles in the company of kings with Polynices in the pathetic company of exiles (*turbae* contemptuous). Polynices' reply *regna, dummodo invisus tuis* is not, of course, a literal ceding of the throne, but a sarcastic granting of permission just like that of Megara to the tyrant Lycus, *dominare ut libet/dum solita regni fata te nostri manent* (*Herc* 395: note the comparable *dummodo* here).

Leo decided that Eteocles' interlocutor should be Jocasta, not Polynices. He gave no reasons, but was no doubt motivated, as often, by a desire to cleave as closely as possible to the 'best manuscript.' The result is a dialogue between mother and son which would be extraordinarily brusque and lacking in *pietas* by the standards of ancient drama (even Senecan drama); its tone might be conceivable at the *end* of an increasingly acrimonious dialogue between them, but hardly without such preparation. That Eteocles should exile his own mother at the drop of a hat, and for no greater crime than noting that Theban kings come to sticky ends (645–51), is highly improbable, and corresponds to nothing in the mythical tradition.[9]

Phoen 663

Herrmann rightly followed Grotius in assigning 653 and 660 to Polynices (see above), but gave 663 to Jocasta. Perhaps he felt it would be hypocritical for the invader Polynices to criticise Eteocles for endangering the city. But Senecan figures, like modern politicians and teenagers, regularly blame others and exculpate themselves in the most outrageous fashion: e.g. Eteocles has just held Jove responsible for his own propensity to tyranny (655f.).

---

[8] As Frank notes on Sen. 652–3, these Euripidean lines refute Axelson's argument (*KK*) that *te turbae exulum ascribo* cannot be addressed to Polynices because he is already an exile.

[9] Most editors since Leo have fallen in behind him. Frank does so too, but regards *te turbae exulum ascribo* as addressed to Polynices—an awkward compromise. This *te* is surely addressed to the same person as the *tu* of 662, particularly in view of the contrast between kingship and exile in each place.

***Med* 19**

EA offer *mihi peius aliquid quod precer sponso malum*, "I have something worse to pray for the bridegroom as an evil." This predicative use of *malum* is weak, particularly after *peius*, and the ellipse of *est* is awkward here. Bentley's *est peius aliquod quod precer sponso malum*, "There is a worse evil that I can pray for the bridegroom," avoids the predicative *malum*. However, it uneconomically supposes corruption in two places (*mihi* and *aliquid*), and creates the cacophonous *aliquod quod*. Further, substantival *malum* is qualified by *maius* 10 times in STrag, but never by *peius* for obvious stylistic reasons (*peius malum* is found only at *HO* 852 as a variant).[1]

All these difficulties are eliminated by Leo's correction *mihi peius aliquid quod precer sponso manet*, "I have something worse left to pray for the bridegroom." For *maneo* with Dat. cf. *Oed* 236 *nec tibi longa manent sceleratae gaudia caedis*.

***Med* 23–24**

Lines 20–22[2] imply a desire on Medea's part that Jason, while wandering in exile, should be obsessed by a longing for what he lacks, i.e. a *certum larem*. *Optet* then follows naturally; let him long also for those ingredients of a conventional happy home, a wife, and children who take after their parents. Medea's point is that this longing will be vitiated, this wish contaminated, by his situation, since the only wife he can long for (Creusa being dead, 17) is the evil Medea, while children resembling these parents (viz. Jason and Medea) would be monsters.[3]

---

[1] Zw. favours solutions which split the line in two: *Num peius aliquid? quod precer sponso malum?* (OCT 1986, cf. *KK*) or *Est peius aliquid? quod precer sponso malum?* (OCT 1991, cf. Zw. 1987 85 and 1987[2] 384). These versions seem to me artificial, since they rely heavily on modern punctuation, and since they separate two notions, viz. 'worse' and 'Jason,' which should interact.

[2] I.e. 20–21 and 23[a]–22[b]: I take for granted Leo's transposition of 22[a] and 23[a].

[3] My understanding of the passage agrees with that of Hudson-Williams 1991 428f. Unfortunately *KK* does not explain why Axelson and Zw. find *optet* inappro-

Med 39–40

Gronovius in a brilliant and much-cited note (ad 25, quoted by Costa on 23ff.) recognised the multivalency of language in this section of the prologue. Clearly *victimas* refers overtly to animal victims, but secondarily and fiercely implies human victims (viz. Creusa and perhaps Creon and/or Jason), as e.g. at *Thy* 545 (cf. Leo 1.166 fn. 7).

Following Anliker 37 (see also Hine ad loc.) I see several possible meanings in *viscera*:

1. The overt reference is to entrails of the sacrificial animals, through which Medea might discover by extispicy a means of revenge (for *viscera* = *exta* cf. *Oed* 352).
2. The flesh and guts of the human victims.
3. The listener may also hear the meaning of *viscera* = children (*OLD* s.v. *viscus* 5, citing Ov. *Rem.* 59 *nec dolor armasset contra sua viscera matrem*, sc. *Medeam*), and so perceive a foreshadowing of Medea's eventual murder of them, though she herself does not yet plan to kill them.
4. Gronovius understood *per viscera ipsa* to mean "through your own guts," citing *Ag* 199–201. But in that passage Clytemnestra envisages killing herself and her husband as they lie together, whereas nothing in the present passage points to such a scenario.

Zw. takes (4) as Medea's intended meaning and (3) as a meaning unintended by her. He does not recognise (1) and (2), and therefore starts a new paragraph at line 40. But "it is surely impossible not to link *victimas* and *viscera*" (Costa).

Med 53

Linquis (EA) is a choice example of the present indicative used in a deliberative question, cf. Plaut. *Men.* 176 *iam fores ferio?*, *Pers.* 666 *Toxile, quid ago?*, Sen. *Herc* 964 *an contumacis ianuam mundi traho?*, *Phoen* 450 *an dico et ex quo?*, H-S 308. (There is a corresponding North American idiom, e.g. "What do I do now?" = "What am I to do now?") Predictably *linquis* is altered to *linques*, first apparently in the MS used by Trevet. But a question asking rhetorically how Medea

---

priate "aus inhaltlichen Gründen" to the object *liberos . . . matri*. Some commentators oddly take *matri* as referring to Creusa, but, on the scenario Medea is envisaging, Creusa has already been killed (Gronovius).

should leave fits better into the context, with its focus on a requisite and appropriate scale of revenge, than a question asking how she *will* leave. In any case, there is no justification for changing the paradosis.

Med 73

Leo's punctuation, with a comma after *matres*, seems more pointed than the traditional punctuation with a comma after *avide/avidae*: see *KK*. For anaphora postponed by an intensifying adverb cf. 922 *placuit . . . meritoque placuit*; for the pronoun postponed in enumerative anaphora cf. *Tro* 118, 354, *Herc* 910, Ov. *Met.* 11.45–47 *te carmina saepe secutae/fleverunt silvae, positis te frondibus arbor/tonsa comas luxit.*

Med 98

Leo's hypothesis of a lacuna between lines 98 and 99 is justified by several considerations.

1. Without it, Creusa is twice compared to the rising sun (95, 100) in a single series of similes.
2. The first two similes (95–98) are concerned with Creusa's pre-eminence among women for beauty, the topic announced in 93–94. The other two similes, however, address a different topic, viz. her colour, which has not been introduced.
3. In a context of marriage, a simile illustrating the topic of "white suffused or mixed with red" (99f.) is frequently applied to the blush of a girl, prompted by the presence or gaze of her *sponsus* or by the *deductio*, cf. [Tib.] 3.4.30–34, V. *Aen.* 12.67–69 *Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro/si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa/alba rosa, talis virgo dabat ore colores* (Lavinia in Turnus' presence), Ov. *Am.* 2.5.33–37 *at illi/conscia purpureus venit in ora pudor,/quale coloratum Tithoni coniuge caelum/subrubet aut sponso visa puella novo* [sc. "a girl seen by her new husband-to-be"],/*quale rosae fulgent inter sua lilia mixtae* e.q.s., Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.12, 244f. *non talis niveos tinxit Lavinia vultus,/cum Turno spectante rubet.* These passages confirm that the topic of 99f. is different from that of the preceding lines. We would therefore expect one of the aspects of marriage appearing in these passages to be mentioned before 99.
4. In the final simile (100f.) the detail of a shepherd watching the dawn is gratuitous if the point of comparison is only Creusa's beauty, but much more apposite if the situation is that of Jason

gazing at Creusa. Leo's supplement, which supplies such a situation, is therefore on the right lines: *talem dum iuvenis conspicit, en rubor/perfudit subito purpureus genas*.

Unfortunately, however, Leo appears to have taken the blush illustrated by the similes of 99–101 as that of Jason (so Kapnukajas 102 and Zw. understand him). He thereby secured, in 93–98/99–101 as supplemented, a balance of lines devoted to female and male, bride and groom, such as is common in wedding-hymns (e.g. Cat. 61 and 62) and occurs immediately above in 75–81/82–89. But the notion of a blushing bridegroom does not fit either the topos (as seen above) or this previously married *sponsus*. Nevertheless Leo's supplement needs little adjustment to turn the blush into that of the bride. I suggest *sponso si cupido conspicitur, pudor/perfundit teneras purpureus genas*.

Med 115

Fugitiva (E) has occasionally been suspected because it is rare in high poetry, as a word usually applied to runaway slaves (so Gronovius, who preferred A's *fugitura*). But just because of its usual application it is forcefully pejorative here; Ovid similarly applies it pejoratively to a free woman, Helen, at *Her.* 5.91 *Tyndaris . . . fugitiva* (a heightening of Hor. *Carm.* 3.3.20 *mulier peregrina*). Here *fugitiva* combines with *peregrino* to convey the alienation from community involved in such a marriage; compare the emphasis in 102f. on Medea's foreignness, contrasted with Creusa's thoroughly Greek ancestry (*Aeoliam*).[4]

Med 156

"*Clepere* regularly denotes theft, stealth, or improper concealment (cf. κλέπτειν), as the passages cited by *TLL* show, and Medea's use of it expresses her contempt for the course of action suggested by her nurse" (Fitch on *Herc* 799, contra Costa's comment here, "*tegere* would have done as well").

Med 171

Heinsius followed by Zw. altered the transmitted *vides* to *vide*, citing 429 and Ov. *Met.* 6.634 *cui sis nupta vide, Pandione nata, marito!* But

[4] In support of Heinsius' conjecture *furtiva* Zw. cites various passages where *furtum, furtivus, furor* refer to "stolen," i.e. extra-marital, sex; but since the Chorus do not question that Medea married Jason (*nubit, marito*), that usage is not relevant.

the context of those passages is different. There *vide* could be translated "think," and is part of an exhortation to a certain course of action. Here *vides* is used in rejection of an exhortation, and means "you can see" the nature of Jason (from his actions, including the recently witnessed wedding), just as the Nurse "can see" the nature of Medea herself (*vides* 166). *Vides* is factual because the Nurse does indeed see what manner of man Jason is, 164 *coniugis nulla est fides*.

***Med* 172**

A has *et* and E the unmetrical *sed*; editors print Ascensius' conjecture *at*. But if *at* had been the original reading, E would have had no motive for replacing it with *sed*, whereas *et* is paradoxical and might well trigger the change in a literal-minded scribe (on this characteristic of E, see my comm. on *Herc* 683f.). *Et* is paradoxical because Medea is rejecting the Nurse's commonsense assumption that flight and revenge are mutually exclusive; she will take both options, flight *and* revenge. For *et* linking two things that seem mutually exclusive cf. *Ag* 149 *piget prioris et novum crimen struis?*

***Med* 181**

A's *manus* is accepted by editors. Hendry 1998 109–11 suggests that E's meaningless variant *minus* points to deeper corruption, and that the line originally read *nota fraus, nota est nimis*. This has notable Senecan parallels at *Thy* 402f. *qui notus nimis omnibus/ignotus moritur sibi* and *Tro* 757f. *virtus Ulixis Danaidis nota est satis,/nimisque Phygibus*. But *manus* is used repeatedly in this play to emphasise Medea's hands as instruments of violence, v. 128, 264, 479, 522, 809, 901, 908, 952, 969, 977, 987, 1009. It seems advisable, therefore, to make no change. Mechanical corruption of *man*- to *min*- is not uncommon, as Hendry notes (fn. 6).

***Med* 215**

For *ripa* = 'stream' v. my note below on 742 *Tartari ripis ligatos . . . specus*.

***Med* 242–43**

Zw.'s proposed deletion of these lines (1976 192–94) is justified by their inappropriateness to the context. Medea has challenged Creon to decide her case on judicial, not political grounds (192–200). In the section beginning at 236, she concedes that she is guilty of many

crimes, but pleads that her guilt (which would argue for condemnation and exile) is inextricably linked with the fact that she saved the lives of the Argonauts (which would argue for leniency). The issue of her guilt and its beneficent consequences then modulates in a new direction in 244. In this close-knit legal argument, vague talk of fortune's blows is out of place. It is also noteworthy that the focus immediately before and after 242–43 is on Jason, and the fact that he is now in Creon's control, not Medea's (*hic tuus gener* 240, *hoc est penes te* 245): consequently if 242–43 are removed, 244 follows well after 241.

The vagueness of 242 is evident also in the looseness with which the word *causa* is used. In this legalistic agon one would expect it to mean a quasi-legal 'case,' as at 202 and 262, but clearly it does not, in view of the reference to fortune's crushing blows; even to translate 'situation' would give the word too much meaning here, for in fact *causam . . . nostram* is merely a circumlocution for *me*, as Miller and Costa see. There is also evident awkwardness in the phrase *tot regum decus*: among 45 uses of *decus* in STrag,[5] Zw. found only one other instance of an accompanying genitive of definition, viz. *Herc* 1270f. *violatum decus virtutis*, which is less awkward than *tot regum decus* here.[6]

Med 248

There are arguments for each variant, viz. the genitive *dextrae* (A *dextre*) and the ablative *dextra* (RE). In favour of the genitive, the role of the *dextra* as guarantor of *fides* is very familiar, e.g. Cic. *Verr.* 5.153 *dextera . . . fidem porrexit*, V. *Aen.* 4.597 *en dextra fidesque, TLL* 5.927.64–73; in favour of the ablative, the *dextra* is also used in supplication, cf.

---

[5] Zw.'s figure of 52 uses of *decus* "im Tragödienkorpus" is puzzling: if it excludes ps-Sen. it is too high, but if not, it is too low.

[6] Watt 1996 249–50 compares Cat. 64.78 *decus innuptarum*, but that is generally taken as a partitive genitive, "the flower of unwedded girls," which matches the preceding *electos iuvenes*. A plural genitive of definition is not of course unthinkable, as is shown by Sil. 10.399 *cristarum decus* cited by Watt.

The phrase *quae volet* has aroused suspicion and conjecture, from Avantius' *qua volet* of 1517 to Delz's *quaelibet* of 1989[2] 507 and Watt's *quam volet* (= *quamvis*). The objection to *quae volet* is presumably that it gives too great a degree of personification to *fortuna*, which is used here in its weak sense of a particular manifestation of fortune (cf. *Tro* 562 *fortuna quae possedit, Ag* 415 *aut quae maris fortuna dispulerit duces*). But if the remainder of 242–43 were tolerable, *quae volet* could surely be taken as virtually equivalent to *quaelibet* or *quaevis*.

Tro 691–93 and the phrase *supplice dextra* at *Tro* 709, V.Fl. 4.11, Stat. *Silv*. 1.2.67, *Theb*. 11.688. Elsewhere *praeses* in STrag is a virtual adjective (always of gods, *Herc* 356, *Pha* 109, *Oed* 1042, *Thy* 1102), which favours *dextrae* here. The conjunction *praesidis dextrae* suits Sen.'s liking for noun-adjective pairs, whereas the RE version is less stylish. Either variant could have arisen through corruption, A's through assimilation to the case of *praesidis*, RE's through unfamiliarity with *praeses* used as adjective rather than noun—no doubt the cause of E's insertion of *et* at *Oed* 1042. On balance the arguments for *dextrae* look stronger.

***Med* 267**

Strzelecki 1938 finds 1119 instances of resolved second feet in STrag and ps.-Sen. (45), but no parallel among them for a conflict of ictus and accent such as occurs in the EA reading *cui feminea*, which is therefore very probably faulty (48). Editors since have adopted the reading of R, *cui feminae*. But respect needs to be paid to Sen.'s skills in rhetoric as well as in metre. The adjective *femineus* is effectively deployed in generalisations about female criminality, *Pha* 687 *o scelere vincens omne femineum genus*, 828 *instruitur omnis fraude feminea dolus*, *Ag* 116 *femineos dolos*; and the adjective *virilis* here points to a contrasting *femineus*, cf. *Ag* 641f. *ducunt turmas, haec femineas,/ille viriles*. R's reading *feminae*, though presumably a genitive, would tend to be mis-heard by the audience as a dative agreeing with *cui*. In all probability, then, Bothe's *feminea cui*, which mends the metre, is correct, and R's *feminae* is a simple error for *feminea*.[7]

***Med* 293**

Rather than "too little" (so e.g. Kingery, and Costa in an interesting note), some interpreters think *parum* means "just a little" (Miller), "recht wenig" (Zw.). But the line then lacks the adaptation of previous

[7] Early editors followed by Zw. place a comma after *nequitia*, thus attaching *ad audendum omnia* to *robur virile est*, against the natural flow of sense and syntax. This punctuation perhaps reflects a cultural assumption that criminal "daring" cannot be attributed to women. Similarly at Livy 1.46.6 *muliebri cessaret audacia* "Bayet, following Cornelissen, objected that *audacia* was not a feminine quality" and changed the text accordingly (Ogilvie ad loc.). Contra cf. *Herc* 386f. *matres* . . ./*passas et ausas scelera*, *Pha* 688, 824 *quid sinat inausum feminae praeceps furor*, *Ag* 117ff. *quod ulla coniunx perfida* . . ./. . .*quod novercales manus/ausae, quod ardens impia virgo face*.

ideas and words which is characteristic of Senecan stichomythia. The issue of 291–92 is how much time is *enough* for a plot: Medea caps this by saying the time, if granted, will not even be enough for her tears. The literal-minded could object that she does not know how much time will be granted, but rhetorically part of the point is that conventionally no time is long enough for tears (*Tro* 788, 812, *Pha* 1244), and practically it is evident that any time granted will be short. In STrag *parum*, when not functioning as a virtual negative (*OLD* s.v. 3), usually means "too little," *Herc* 49, *Phoen* 144, 271, *Ag* 293, 970, *Thy* 71, 257; there is a dative parallel to *lacrimis* here at *Phoen* 143f. *nam sceleri haec meo/parum alta nox est.*

***Med* 315**

A minor tradition identifies Bootes with Icarus (Zw. ad loc., Mayer 1990 401–02). But while it would be an agreeable exercise in *doctrina* to speak of "the Athenian Bootes" on these grounds (V. Fl. 2.68 *Actaeus Bootes*), it would be merely baffling to call the *Wain* "Attic" (*attica* E), since the Wain's alter ego is the Great Bear (my comm. on *Herc* 131), known as "Arcadian" because of Callisto's origins, *Pha* 288, *Oed* 477. Furthermore it would be incongruous to characterise Bootes as *senex tardus* in a context which identified him as the youthful Icarus. Probably, therefore, *Arctica* (variously spelled by the A MSS) is correct, though a rare and technical word which apparently does not occur elsewhere in classical verse.[8] It is conceivable, however, that an original *frigida* vel sim. was displaced by a gloss *arctica*, which was then further corrupted in E.

***Med* 320**

Richter's conjecture *nautis* for *ventis* remained in decent obscurity until revived by Billerbeck 1988 117 fn., who calls it absolutely indispensable ("wohl unumgänglich") on the grounds that Tiphys is presented as the inventor of the art of sailing, as described in the following lines. But the striking application of the word *leges* to natural forces is guaranteed by 364f. *pontus . . . omnes/patitur leges*. Like

[8] The word is used by Greek and Roman writers in astronomical contexts, of the northern pole or the heavenly "arctic circle" around it. It is worth noting that Sen. also introduces the Latin form of ἀρκτῷος to poetry. Paconius *poet.* 2 has the phrase *arctoo plaustro*.

many of Sen.'s best phrases, this one is memorable by paradox, since to write laws for the winds in a literal sense would be an exercise in futility; the hyperbole of the phrase conveys the hubris—and the precariousness—of Tiphys' efforts (see Hine ad loc.). Similarly the phrasing of 304 *animam levibus credidit auris* conveys the recklessness of such an action, cf. V. *Aen.* 5.850f. *Aenean credam . . . fallacibus auris?*

***Med* 343**

See *SA* 65–66 on the lacuna and supplement.

***Med* 345f.**

See *SA* 36–37 in defence of *astra* (A).

***Med* 367**

Zw. notes that *remos referre* (*reducere*) *ad pectora* is used of rowers pulling at their oars at Ov. *Trist.* 4.1.9 (*Met.* 11.461f.). He suggests that *remos referens* here means "pulling back the oars," i.e. that the *Argo* is credited with the action of her rowers, as e.g. in *Tro* Penthesileia is credited with the action of her troops, and Memnon with the action of his native Tigris (11–13, v. *KK* on 8–14; for the usage see below on *Pha* 88). This may be right, but one would have expected some clearer indication of this special sense of *referre*; I therefore take the verb in the general sense 'bring home.' The point is the *safe* return, as at 454f. *Pontici fauces freti/ per quas revexi nobilem regum manum*, V. Fl. 1.98f. (of the *Argo*) *iam stare ratem remisque superbam/poscere quos revehat*, 2.423f *refer et domitis a Colchidos oris/vela* (all cited by Damsté 1918 408): the safe return indicates *Argo*'s ability to master the sea's dangers. *Remos* is used by synecdoche for the rowers, cf. V. Fl. 7.25 *grataque iam fessis descendunt flamina remis*. The compound *referens* was perhaps chosen in part for alliteration, cf. 362 *maiusque mari Medea malum*.

***Med* 413**

The use of *inhibere* is startling and paradoxical. Stormy seas and wind-driven fires are not usually associated with *restraint*. Further, elsewhere in this play Medea is aligned with, not opposed to, the destructive forces of water and fire (v. particularly 33–36, 166–67, 754–69, 885–87, Pratt 1963 passim (esp. 215), Fitch 1974 139–46). The force of *inhibere*, then, lies in its unexpectedness. At the same time it takes up the theme of limit and restraint from earlier (150–76,

381, 397–98): Medea's *furor* cannot be checked by her Nurse (381), by Medea herself or even by nature's strongest forces.[9]

Conjecture is therefore unnecessary. Leo suggested *imitari*, but the context is comparing Medea to natural forces, not likening natural forces to Medea through personification. Furthermore *imitari*, not a common verb in STrag, appeared just above at 398. At one time I considered *aequare* (for *aequo* = 'equal, match' cf. *Pha* 807 *aequas Herculeos nam iuvenis toros*.) But neither Leo's conjecture nor my own would explain the intrusion of *inhibere*.

Med 457

Commentators complain that *parvam* is inappropriate to Iolcos, described by Homer as well-founded (*Il.* 2.712) and spacious (*Od.* 11.256), and that Tempe has no connection with the Medea legend. But in fact Tempe is twice mentioned by Ovid as a place seen by Medea as she flew over Thessaly in her dragon chariot, *Met.* 7.222, 371. Stähli-Peter on *Pha* 24, followed by Mayer, thinks that *parvus* here, and at *Tro* 221 *parva Lyrnesos*, 821 *parva Gyrtone*, 856 *parva Zacyntho*, is used in a decorative way, without regard to actual size. Like Zw. 1977 160 I find *parvus* actually not inappropriate in context to the places mentioned in *Tro*.

Here, however, I suggest that both *parva* and Tempe are more relevant to the rhetoric of the moment. Medea, whose father's kingdom covered the northeastern hinterland of the Black Sea (211–16) and received spoil from as far away as India (483–86), might well regard Iolcos as small and provincial by comparison (cf. Costa ad loc.), particularly when scoring points off Jason: this is meiosis in its literal sense, viz. belittlement. And *Thessala Tempe* is perhaps mentioned sarcastically, almost in quotation marks, as a beauty-spot shown to visitors (like the Samaria Gorge in modern Crete, or Butchart Gardens in Victoria). So the gist of the line is, "Should I visit your little hometown, or your local beauty-spot?"[10] For adjectives more relevant to Medea's frame of mind than to geographical reality, cf. 211 *placidis flexibus*, 762 *violenta . . . vada*, both of the R. Phasis. Hine comments on 762, "The contexts are important: at 211 she is giving

---

[9] I owe the outlines of this defence of *inhibere* to Harry Hine.

[10] Zw. ingeniously conjectures *pa<t>ruamne Iolcon*. *Patruus* as an adjective, however, is securely attested only at Hor. *Carm.* 3.12.3. Here it would mean "belonging to *your* uncle," Pelias.

a rather idealised account of her homeland; here the river's violence suggests its resistance, and its inferiority, to M.'s magical powers."

Med 477

Defence of the line in its transmitted place as a climax to Medea's list of her services to Jason (Costa) is not persuasive, since the line is syntactically isolated, and refers to a sacrifice made by Medea, rather than an active service such as those listed in 466–76 (so Zw. *Rez.* 189 fn. 10). To move the line after 482 with Leo alleviates the second of these difficulties, but the phrase *aliena quaerens regna* still yields no appropriate sense. It can hardly mean "seeking to reach others' kingdoms (or another's kingdom)," for Medea's motive in abandoning Colchis is regularly represented as desire for Jason, not for tourism or a new home (Zw. 1976 195);[11] *regna* would also lack point if it were merely a synonym for *terras*. The phrase would therefore need to mean either "seeking a kingdom for another," viz. Jason (so Miller), or "seeking to gain a kingdom belonging to another," viz. Pelias. This motive of acquiring a throne for Jason, however, is rarely attributed even to the hero himself, much less to Medea, in the mythographic tradition: "Pindar remains our only author to make the rule of Iolkos . . . Iason's promised reward should he bring back the Fleece (*Py* 4.138–67)" (Gantz 365). Zw.'s excision of the line is therefore justified.

Med 512

On the iambic fifth foot (*nepotibus*), see above on *Tro* 1080.

Med 516ff.

Leo's treatment of this passage has unfortunately spawned some red herrings. The traditional interpretation of Jason's *hinc rex et illinc* is correct: "there is a king on this side and on that," viz. Creon and Acastus. This does not mean, however, that they are equally threatening ("utrimque regem imminere dixit," Leo 2.379), but rather that it is prudent for Jason to side with the king who offers protection. Still less does 516[a] mean the same as 525–26, i.e. that the two kings

[11] Less persuasive is Zw.'s rhetorical analysis (ibid.) of the passage as two long periods, 465–82 and 483–89 (hence the colon rather than period after 476 in the OCT). This analysis overlooks the evident change in Medea's tone after 476, from insistence on her *merita* to appeal as a suppliant.

are collaborating, as Leo oddly thought; the possibility of their collaborating arises only after Medea suggests that Jason should desert Creon to flee with her (522–24). Rather *hinc* and *illinc* indicate opposing factors, as Zw. 1976 198 sees, citing *Tro* 643 *hinc natus, illinc coniugis cari cinis, Oed* 830, *Thy* 302.

The thought of *hinc rex et illinc* is complete (with *est* understood). Consequently there is no justification for placing a dash after it to indicate an incomplete statement interrupted by Medea, as Leo did followed e.g. by Miller, Giardina and Zw.[12]

If the above interpretation of *hinc rex et illinc* is correct, Medea in 517–18 is sarcastically suggesting a contest in which she will take on *both* kings (as in 527–28 she envisages taking on even more enemies). This supports the E reading *his* in 516 (viz. the two kings), as clarifying the reference of *nos* and *certemus* in 517. Finally it is conceivable that *confligere* in 517 is a gloss on *certemus* that has displaced the original word preceding *certemus* (so Axelson in *KK*); but since the simple correction *conflige* yields good sense, there is no strong reason for multiplying hypotheses.

It is worth noting that neither in 516[a] nor in 518[a]–19 nor in 529[a] does Jason respond directly to what Medea has just said. In each instance he refuses to engage with Medea's fantasies, and sticks doggedly to practical realities as he sees them.

Med 553

The alternatives of punctuating after *gratum est* (see *KK*) or after *illud* are equally balanced. On either punctuation, the present tense of *gratum est* should be noted: not "will be a boon" (Miller, cf. Kingery, Herrmann) but "it *is* appreciated," i.e. "I thank you" (Hine). This, then, is another stage direction written into the text: it indicates that Jason has made a gesture of assent, presumably a nod (cf. Latin *adnuo*), at the end of 552.

Med 617

The transmitted *in primis*, which I spell *imprimis* with *TLL* and *OLD* to identify its adverbial function, makes good sense: Tiphys' death

[12] If the thought is incomplete, Jason was presumably going to say that what is on the other side (*illinc*) is not a king but something else. Müller 1901 265 suggested that Jason was about to say "hinc rex et illinc exul impotens," the *rex* being Creon. But it is not characteristic of Jason to set himself against Creon in this way.

is placed "first and foremost" in the catalogue because he most obviously challenged the sea by inventing the art of sailing, and because he died early in the voyage. The objections of Axelson and Zw. (1987[2] 382f.) may be set aside. They call *imprimis* prosaic, but although avoided by some poets (*TLL* 7.1.677.42–44) it is used by Lucretius, by Horace, and by Vergil in *Ecl., Georg.* and *Aen.*; in any case, Sen. does not systematically avoid 'prosaic' vocabulary (my comm. on *Herc* p. 185). Zw. conjectures *Tiphys en primus domitor profundi*. Tiphys, however, is not presented in *Med* as the *first* conqueror of the sea (as if others had to repeat the conquest), but as *the* conqueror, the man who laid down the art of sailing for others to follow (318–28), with the result that nowadays navigation is trivial (364–68). The same objection applies to Axelson's rephrasing of the line by punctuation *Tiphys, in primis domitor profundi*, i.e. "Tiphys, among the first conquerors of the deep." Zw. quickly reverted to the traditional *Tiphys in primis, domitor profundi* (1987 86).

Med 666

The line is contained in a papyrus fragment of the *Medea*, possibly of the fourth century. The editors of the papyrus rightly regard this as evidence supporting Zw.'s thesis that interpolated lines were already present in the text in antiquity (*Proleg.* 50–52).[13]

Med 676

The transmitted reading *evasit* and its sense "went out [of the house]" is confirmed by Ov. *Met.* 7.182 *egreditur tectis*, in a conjuration by Medea which has many similarities to the present scene.[14] Since a *penetrale* is regularly an inner sanctum or shrine *within* a larger complex[15] (*OLD* s.v.), the meaning must be that Medea left the main part of the house and went to an inner courtyard or some other remote area of the property. This is consistent with the prior indication at

---

[13] Donka Markus and Gregg W. Schwender, "Seneca's *Medea* in Egypt (663–704)", *ZPE* 117 (1997) 73–80.

[14] This *evasit* surely cannot mean "went off [the stage]" (*pace* Costa and Hine ad loc.), which would be a metatheatrical usage and inappropriate here.

[15] Cf. Eur. *Med* 397 Ἑκάτην μυχοῖς ναίουσαν ἑστίας ἐμῆς with Page ad loc., "Medea has chosen Hekate . . . to be here the goddess of her household: thus she has her altar in the *penetralia* of the palace." Similarly the *penetrale* of *Thy* 652 is deep within the sprawling demesne of the palace.

578 that the ritual is to take place on the property, i.e. not in public view.

In *Med* as in much of STrag the setting is fluid, and becomes defined only when necessary for the action (as at 973ff., where Medea climbs to the roof of her house). It must be emphasised that an audience, occupied with listening to the play's text, will not think critically about location or other practical issues unless the text draws attention to those issues. In the present Act, the locale of the Nurse's speech is completely indeterminate. Once Medea begins her invocation at 740 we envisage (perhaps not even consciously) a remote and private area, presumably near the *penetrale*. This setting is different from the more public space implied in the previous Act, but to speak of a scene-change would suggest something too definite and objective.[16] Zw. is right that such treatment of space relies chiefly on the audience's imagination (*Rez.* 40–42); but his conclusion is more doubtful, for the audience's imagination can surely work as freely during a dramatic performance as during a recitation.

Med 677

Heinsius 126 could be right that Sen. wrote not the transmitted *effudit* but *effundit*: for the familiar pattern of perfects in temporal clauses followed by present main verbs cf. *Herc* 813, *Med* 705, *Pha* 1002, 1060, *Ag* 427, *Thy* 682, 759. But there are parallels for the sequence 'perfect in temporal clause, perfect main verb, present main verb(s)' at *Ag* 421–22 and *Tro* 1148–52; in view of these, and of Sen.'s penchant for varying verb tenses (on which see Zw. 1977[2] 567 and *KK* on *Tro* 676), it seems better practice to make no change.[17]

---

[16] It seems to me unsound to develop the brief and passing mentions of place at 177 and 380 into a hypothesis of a "two-building set" consisting of Creon's palace and Medea's house (Sutton 11–12, 68–70). These two lines are primarily entrance-announcements, which also characterise the persons entering (Creon as peremptory, Medea as impetuous). In Acts 4 and 5 it is natural to assume that Creon's palace is some distance away.

[17] The scribe of the papyrus (fn. above on *Med* 666) writes *effundit*, which is altered by the second hand to *effudit*. In other places the second hand is right, correcting the scribe's *manibus* to *maius* in 674, *Libyca* to *Libyae* in 682, *geminat* to *gemina* in 700. I therefore regard the scribe's *effundit* as an error, possibly influenced by the tense of *promit*, not as lending support to Heinsius' conjecture.

Med 680

E's reading *comprecans* is found also in the papyrus fragment (see above on 666). The editors of the papyrus rightly regard *comprecans* as the correct reading, which therefore does not indicate a stemmatic relationship between the papyrus and the E tradition.

The Nurse describes Medea as gathering two categories of magical resources, first those she has in store (677–79) and second those which must be summoned from a distance (681–84). The latter process requires considerable supernatural power, and Medea therefore *prays* to Hecate, represented by her statue and altar (*sacrum* 680), for aid; for *sacrum* in this sense in a context of prayer, cf. *Pha* 424 *ipsum intuor sollemne venerantem sacrum.*[18] Similarly in the source-passage (Ov. *Met.* 7.192ff.) Medea prays for Hecate's aid in collecting ingredients for her potion. Hecate's power will collaborate with Medea's own magic spells (*magicis cantibus* 684, *carmine* 688), just as later Medea asks Hecate to reinforce her own poisons (833). For Hecate's power collaborating with spells or poisons cf. Eur. *Ion* 1048–57, *Med* 397, Theoc. 2.14–16, Hor. *Sat.* 1.8.33, Ov. *Met.* 7.195.

Medea's hand (*laeva . . . manu*) is possibly raised in appeal towards the statue, or more probably used to hold the altar as is common in prayer, supplication etc. (cf. V. *Aen.* 4.219 *talibus orantem dictis arasque tenentem* with Pease ad loc., Sen. *Herc* 876 *aras tangite supplices*). (Use of the *left* hand of course has sinister connotations here, cf. *Oed* 566; similarly she prays *voce non fausta, Med* 12.)[19] The general word *sacrum* does not distinguish between the statue and the associated altar: 'shrine' is an approximation in English. There can be no objection to the phrase *comprecans sacrum* (*pace* Schroeder), since it is a familiar metonymy to speak of worshipping or praying to statues, altars and temples, e.g. Sen. frag. 120 *simulacra deorum venerantur, illis supplicant genu posito, illa adorant*, Min. Fel. 23.9 *horum imagines consecratas vulgus orare*, Ov. *Trist.* 2.291 *adoranti Iunonis templa*, Sen. *Ag* 392–94 *delubra et aras caelitum . . . supplex adoro*, 792 *veneremur aras.*

A's reading *complicans* yields no sense. Schroeder's unjustified objection to the E reading led to a plethora of superfluous conjectures,

---

[18] This statue of Diana in *Pha* must be envisaged as onstage, v. my comm. on *Herc* 356.

[19] Markus *ZPE* 132 (2000) 149–50 cites evidence of specific gestures with the left hand while the right hand was raised, in prayers to the underworld gods or in magical contexts. It seems more likely, however, that here we are to envisage Medea using the left hand *instead* of the right.

among which Bücheler's *comparans* has won some support. Now Medea, "while preparing her grim ritual with her left hand," summons *pestes* from far and wide (with her right hand?). The linking of these activities is faintly comic, as if Sen. were admiring Medea's adroitness in the kitchen. Some of the other conjectures are listed by Zw. 1976 205f.

***Med* 694**

On Zw.'s conjecture *patens* see above on *Phoen* 603.

***Med* 713**

The MSS offer *lucis . . . Hyrcaniis* vel sim., a bungled reference to the *Hercynia silva* in southern Germany: Hyrcania is a region south-east of the Caspian Sea. Is the error Sen.'s or an early copyist's? Sen. elsewhere, like other poets, uses the form *Hyrcanus* (see *OLD* s.v.), not *Hyrcanius*: *Pha* 70, *Thy* 631, also *Ep*. 113.29. So to attribute *Hyrcaniis* to him here would involve supposing both that he used an unfamiliar form and that he simultaneously muddled his geography. Such an error seems more in keeping with scribes' infinite capacity for deforming and confusing proper names. I therefore follow Avantius in correcting to *Hercyniis*.[20]

***Med* 715**

EA have *discussit*, which yields good sense, and indeed a graphic picture of scattered leaves. The conjecture *decussit*[21] is parallelled in two passages where *honor* is used of trees' foliage as *decus* is here, Hor. *Epod*. 11.5 *tertius December . . . silvis honorem decussit*, V. *Georg*. 2.404 *silvis Aquilo decussit honorem*. But while *decutio* is appropriately used with the ablative of separation *silvis*, here there is no ablative of separation, and the jingle *decussit decus* might be thought unattractive. Gronovius cites also Ov. *Fasti* 5.324 *et subita frondes decutiuntur aqua,* but there the prefix *de-* is justified by the weight of the rainshower. At *HO* 383 I take E's *discussit* to be correct and to echo the present

[20] The second syllable of 'Hercynian' is scanned short at A.R. 4.638 and at several places in late Latin verse listed by Syme 1987 51 and endnotes (I owe this reference to Harry Hine). But Syme notes that vowel quantity in proper names can vary in verse: multiple examples in Vergil are collected by Williams on *Aen*. 5.571; see also *KK* p. 480.

[21] Gronovius, but anticipated in a *varia lectio* reported by Ascensius.

line; A's *decussit* there shows either normalisation or simple confusion of *dis-* with *de-*, for which Zw. cites e.g. *Herc* 279, *Tro* 452, 1102.

Med 742

Zw. 1976 207f., with addenda in *KK* ad loc., collects passages from Vergil to Claudian where *ripa* is claimed to mean 'stream' (a meaning not recognised by *OLD*): most of the instances are indeed convincing. Conjectures such as Billerbeck's *tenebris* for *ripis* (1987 154) are therefore unnecessary.

Med 746–47

Gronovius' emendations in these lines were based on the mistaken belief that E offers the unmetrical *graviorum poena*, which is in fact the reading of A. E's true reading *gravior uni poena* is satisfactory in metre and sense: Medea wants the punishments of the other great sinners suspended, but that of Sisyphus intensified, as he is a member of the hated family into which Jason has married (cf. 512). Use of the telling exception, often with *unus* or *solus*, is characteristic of Sen.'s pointed style, e.g. *Herc* 380, 855f., *Tro* 853–57, 908f., 1109f. 1173, *Oed* 198, 596–98; for the pattern of the sole exception being made in the interests of worse punishment cf. *Med* 19 *mihi peius aliquid quod precer sponso manet, Oed* 28–31, 71–77, 942–45. For indication of the relationship of one of the sinners to the speaker, cf. *Pha* 1235 *et tu mei requiesce Pirithoi pater* (sc. Ixion). The word *mei* at the end of 746 is emphatic and pointed, since Jason is a marriage-relation of Sisyphus as *coniunx* of Creusa, not of Medea.[22]

Gronovius attempted to eliminate the exception by writing *solvat* 'release' for *volvat* in 747, but this forces both *retro* and *per saxa* to go most awkwardly with *lubricus* rather than with the verb. Zw. appears to think the reading *volvat* implies that Sisyphus has *rolled* the stone up the hill, rather than carrying it as in other references in Sen. (v. my comm. on *Herc* 751). Not so: at *Apocol.* 15 vv. 7–8 *sic cum iam summi tanguntur culmina montis/irrita Sisyphio volvuntur pondera collo*, the word *volvuntur* indicates that the boulder, carried uphill on Sisyphus' shoulders, tumbles off them and back downhill; Medea's *volvat* here means that she wants it to tumble Sisyphus himself with

[22] For *socer* used of an ancestor of the father-in-law see *OLD* s.v. (c), citing *Tro* 881 inter alia.

it. (For this sense of *volvo* cf. *Tro* 930 *num [virgo] per has . . . /volvenda rupes?*)

Costa writes, "There is some awkwardness in interrupting the list of those whose punishments are to be relaxed in order to ask that Sisyphus' be intensified." But this is a static analysis, whereas the list has a rhetorical dynamic of increasing relevance to the situation: initially the sinners are to be released simply as grim witnesses to this "strange wedding" (743–45); Sisyphus, however, has a particular, and for Medea undesirable, connection to the wedding; finally the Danaids have an essential, and for Medea propitious, relevance to strange (i.e. murderous) wedding-days. (So Costa: "the Danaids make a good climax in the context of Medea's design.")

Med 760

Axelson and Zw. adopt Markland's emendation *horruit* for *floruit*, giving convincing parallels for the association of *horreo* with winter. *Contra*, Dehon 1992 256f. demonstrates that, although there are occasional mentions of flowers in summer, the flowering season ("la floraison elle-même") is indubitably spring, so that *aestiva tellus floruit* could indeed denote something "exceptionelle, *étonnante*." Nevertheless the structure of 760–61, with its opposition *aestiva/hibernam*, suggests the 'polar' thinking familiar in STrag: summer into winter, winter into summer (so Zw.). Similarly in 754–56 we have attraction of water from where it did not exist, repulsion of it from where it belongs. In addition, the transformations Medea lists as evidence of her powers tend to be absolute ones (water from the dry, the unbathed Bears bathing, harvest in winter, Phasis flowing to its source, a shaded grove suddenly shadeless), whereas *aestiva tellus floruit* would smack more of an extension of the flowering season from spring.

Med 768–69

On the proposed deletion of these lines, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 307f.

Med 773

Discors here is usually translated "rebellious," and that is certainly part of its meaning. But the word often indicates disharmony within members of the same body (e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 115.11 *populus . . . discors*), and is used of hybrid monsters Lucr. 5.894 *discordia membra*, cf. Luc. 1.589f. *monstra . . . quae nullo semine discors/protulerat Natura*; at Sen. *Ep.* 92.10 the *discors inter se iunctura* of human virtue and flesh is com-

pared to the mixture of forms in the Scylla. So here *discors* alludes to Typhoeus' monstrous form, with anthropomorphic body (albeit with 100 heads) and serpentine tail.

Med 788–90

Miller rightly interprets *non quos . . . sed quos* as referring to different aspects of the same entity (here the moon's chariot): cf. *Thy* 1081ff. *manuque non qua . . . sed qua.*

Med 817

Commentators and translators do not indicate a change of addressee here, and so leave us to assume that this command is addressed to Hecate. But one does not instruct a deity to do a task which is perfectly practicable for oneself or another human; Hecate can properly be asked to ensure the efficacy of the poisons 833ff. (v. Gow on Theoc. 2.15f.), but not to roll up her sleeves and apply them. Euripides' Medea plans to do this task herself (789), but *tu nunc* here must indicate someone else.[23] The addressee, then, must be the Nurse, whom Medea already appointed at 568–78 as her assistant in preparing the robes and conveying them to Creusa. Similarly the command at 843–44 to summon the boys and take the gifts to Creusa with their help must be addressed to the Nurse (so Farnaby).

In the same way the task of aspersing the robe to be sent to Hercules is assigned to the Nurse at *HO* 535–38, 563–66, whereas in Soph. *Trach.* Deianira does the task herself.

Med 842

For the flashing torch and barking as symptoms of Hecate's assent to a prayer, Farnaby compared A.R. 3.1216f. στράπτε δ'ἀπειρέσιον δαΐδων σέλας· ἀμφὶ δὲ τήν γε/ὀξείῃ ὑλακῇ χθόνιοι κύνες ἐφθέγγοντο. Hecate is light-bearer both in this chthonian aspect and as moon-goddess (above 788–90, 793f.); hence such titles as φωσφόρος (Eur. *Helen* 569, Ar. *Thesm.* 858, *Lys.* 443, fr. 608) and δᾳδοφόρος (Bacch.

---

[23] Though self-address in the second person is not uncommon, *tu* is so used only once (*Tro* 608) among 71 uses in STrag, and then not with an imperative. For change of addressee without identification, see my *Herc* comm. on 1122ff.; for *tu* with imperative used without identification in resuming address to a subordinate who has been present cf. *Med* 974, *Ag* 404, *Thy* 333.

fr. 1.B.1). This underlines the point of the adjective *lucifera*, and removes any need to consider the alteration to *luctifera* found in recc.

Med 843

Miller translates, "Now all my power is marshalled," which is what the context requires, but *peracta* cannot mean 'marshalled,' nor does it yield any other suitable meaning; *peracta vis est omnis* would be better said after her revenge is accomplished, cf. 1019 *bene est, peractum est*. Watt's correction to *parata* (1996 250) is fully convincing. (For the corruption he compares *Ag* 976 *paratum* E recte, *peractum* A.) *Parata* will have the sense 'made ready for action' (*OLD* s.v. *paro* 6), a familiar meaning in STrag, cf. e.g. *Herc* 364, *Tro* 87, *Med* 51, 532, 899, 972, *Pha* 616, *Oed* 865.

Med 844

Feras indicates that the Nurse is to escort the children and ensure delivery of the gifts. Children of noble birth would not be sent alone, particularly when bearing gifts. *Ferre* can be used of 'conveying' objects through others, but hardly if the 'conveyer' is not accompanying the bearers, as would be the case with Bentley's conjecture *feram*.

Med 886

The phrase *ut iussus*, "as if under orders," conveys the uncanny and supernatural nature of this fire arising from Medea's magic, which is then illustrated further by its ability to consume water like fuel (889f.). Gronovius' conjecture *immissus* is unnecessary, and has an unfortunate ambiguity; it could mean either 'once introduced' (cf. V. *Aen*. 12.51 *immissi . . . ignes*) or 'once set loose.' Gronovius intended the second meaning, and compared *De Ira* 3.6.2 *se regere . . . immissum*, "to rule the self that he has set loose," where however there is no such ambiguity. 'Set loose' would also convey speed ("quasi immissis habenis," Gronovius, cf. V. *Aen*. 5.662 *furit immissis Volcanus habenis*). But this meaning, even if it were clear, would add little to *avidus furit*, whereas *ut iussus* adds the new point noted above.

Med 905

Most critics find the transmitted *age et faxo*, with its immediate linkage of second- and first-person verbs referring to the same person, to be impossibly awkward. Axelson conjectured *en* for *et*, but this *en* would be little more than a filler, a usage rightly questioned by

Kershaw 245f.: "when *en* is used with a first person verb it draws urgent attention to the verb (and person) itself: (e.g.) *en fugio, exeo* (*Oed.* 1053), or to the verb and some essential detail, *en nudus asto* (*Herc.* 1172)," which is not the case here. Leo wrote *hoc age et faxis sciant*, would imply *si hoc egeris, faxis sciant.* More forceful, and therefore more persuasive here, is Richter's *hoc agam et faxo sciant*; this *hoc agam* will have been altered to the more familiar form *hoc age*, which is used at 562 and 976.

Med 910

Costa ad loc. asks, "Is *ingenium* 'wit, inventive skill', with *malis* meaning 'crimes'; or more generally 'nature, essential character', and *malis* 'sufferings'?"[24] To this one might respond, "Is it necessary to choose?" The famous phrase *Medea nunc sum* implies that Medea is "the woman who μήδεται, who has μῆτις" (exactly 'wit, inventive skill'): cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4.27 and Eur. *Med* 402, in both of which places Medea implies that her name carries this meaning.[25] This inventive skill is in-born (*in-genium*) in her, as her name attests, and is therefore a large part of her 'essential character.' Her wit has grown sharper, i.e. her essential character has grown stronger, both through exercise of her criminal abilities and through the difficulties and dangers she has faced.

Med 923

The reading *agnosco* (E) fits perfectly into the sequence of thought in lines 916–25, which constitute Medea's anagnorisis of what she must now do. Her unconscious mind (*animus intus*) has taken the decision already, but has not yet dared to acknowledge it (917–19[a]). As she realises the gist of the decision, she wishes Creusa had children to suffer in place of her own (919[b]–22[a]). She affirms the rightness of the decision (922[b]–23[a]), *recognises* that she must prepare herself to

[24] Hine ad loc. rightly sees that *malis* refers to both sufferings and crimes. For the need to be receptive to multiple meanings, see my note above on 39–40. Henry and Walker at *CP* 62 (1967) 181 fn. 18 assert more definitely than Costa that there is room for one meaning only in the present line. "The Loeb editor treating the phrase *crevit ingenium malis* as if it were the Eton College motto translates "My wit has grown through suffering." Quite clearly it means 'I Medea have come to maturity through crime.'" Liebermann 189 fn. 120 and Zw. take the same view.

[25] For etymological play on Greek names cf. e.g. 311f. *pluvias Hyades*, 650 *Idmonem quamvis . . . nosset*, and 625 *vocali* alluding to Calliope, and v. Fitch & McElduff 2002 26 fn. 24.

carry it through (923^{b}–24^{a}), and finally acknowledges it fully by verbalising it (924^{b}–25)—an acknowledgment so terrible that it is followed by a violent physical reaction (926–27^{a}).[26]

Siegmund followed by Zw. defends the A variant *magno* by reference to 905–15: in the maturity of her powers she has the *magnus animus* necessary to undertake this *ultimum scelus*. But the tone of the two passages is different. In 905–15 she desires in general terms to find some deed worthy of her mature skills, but once the specific deed of infanticide suggests itself, she is less assured: her *animus* dare not acknowledge it, she wishes the target could be Creusa's children, her whole body reacts against the idea. *Magnus animus* would not be appropriate in this context.

Med 928

Tota is almost certainly ablative, *pace* Kingery and others. When the *a* of *tota* is short (nom. fem. sing., nom. or acc. neut. plur.), it falls in a place which is metrically short not anceps, viz. the first half of the fourth foot (13 times) or of the second foot (4 times); the only exception is *Med* 886 *tota occidit* at line-end. Where *tota* occurs in the same position as in this line, it is ablative, *Tro* 1175, *Pha* 185, *Thy* 502.

Med 987

Zwierlein convincingly defends the transmitted *faciunt* here, referring to *OLD* s.v. 30 ('be effective'); one might add that there is an Ovidian precedent for the usage applied to Medea's hands, *Her.* 6.128 *Medeae faciunt ad scelus omne manus.*

Med 1020

This line furnishes another instance of an implied stage-direction. Why does Medea need to tell Jason to raise his eyes to her? It is inconceivable that Jason has not been paying attention as she prepared to kill his surviving son. The answer must be that he has turned away his face at some recent point, probably at the moment

[26] At 549f. Medea perceived the general possibility of wounding Jason through the children. But the question *how* to do so was not considered at that point, and since then her conscious mind has been focussed on preparing revenge on Creusa. On the development of Medea's plans for revenge, see Fitch 1974 128–33.

of the murder. The gesture of averting the gaze, associated with grief, shame etc. (Ov. *Met.* 2.329f., Sen. *Oed* 1011), is often accompanied with weeping, cf. *Herc* 1174f *ora cur condunt sua?/ differte fletus, Pha* 886f. *quidnam ora maesta avertis et lacrimas genis/ subito coortas veste praetenta obtegis?* This confirms the usual interpretation of *tumida* as "tear-swollen" (Miller) rather than "arrogant" (Zw.).

Med 1022

The *sic* of *sic fugere soleo* could be glossed 'amidst murders' (viz. those of Absyrtus and Pelias: so Farnaby), or 'in this dragon-chariot' (as after Pelias' murder,[27] Ov. *Met.* 7.350: so Kingery, Costa). Each interpretation receives support from the context, and there seems no reason to exclude either possibility in so cryptic a phrase (see above on 39–40 and 910).

[27] A single instance is a sufficient basis for a *soleo* in STrag: see my comm. on *Herc* 1101[bis].

This page intentionally left blank

PHAEDRA

***Pha* 2**

Is *Cecropii* genitive singular with *montis*, or vocative plural? The discussion of Stähli-Peter is, as usual, full and indispensable; she decides in favour of the genitive. A point which corroborates that decision is Sen.'s liking for lines containing two noun-adjective pairs in interwoven order (my comm. on *Herc* 216–48). This pattern is more common in iambic trimeters than in anapaestic dimeters for reason of space, but it becomes possible in a dimeter e.g. when the verb is supplied from another line; similar instances in this monody are 65 *latisque feri cornibus uri* and 71 *vacuisque vagus Sarmata campis*, cf. also 34 and 46.

***Pha* 9**

A precedent for the metaphor *nemus texitur* not mentioned by the commentators is Theoc. 7.8 αἴγειροι πτελέαι τε εὔσκιον ἄλσος ὕφαινον, echoed at V. *Ecl.* 9.42 *lentae texunt umbracula vites*.

***Pha* 10**

Zw. 1980 189 replaced EA's *iacent* with *patent*, to create a contrast between dense woods (*texitur*) and open meadows. But the paradosis makes a different and satisfactory contrast, between high woods (*alta*) and low-lying meadows (*iacent*). Similarly at 4f. *iacent* conveys a contrast with the high Mt Parnes. See above on *Phoen* 603 for Zw.'s other needless replacements of *iacere* with *patere*.

***Pha* 13**

Levis used of a slight or slender trickle of water is well parallelled by Mayer from Luc. 4.302. Axelson's conjecture *brevis* ('shallow') was adopted in *KK* but relegated to the app. crit. of the 1991 OCT (see p. xii). Equally unnecessary are Axelson's converse conjectures *levi* for *brevi* at *Oed* 266 (see there) and *levis* for *brevis* at *Tro* 273.

***Pha* 23**

Two objections are raised to the transmitted *parvas*: that Aphidna was actually one of the largest Attic demes; and that the adjective

should characterise the terrain of Aphidna, in keeping with the rest of Hippolytus' list (so *KK*). The first point is inconclusive, since Roman poets do not always put accuracy first in geographical references (but for Sen.'s use of *parvus* see above on *Med* 457). The second, however, is conclusive, and the correction *planas* (Watt 1989 333f.) gives a clear geographical sequence in 22–26 of mountain, plain, seacoast. Watt writes, "It may be that the Aphidna countryside is gently undulating [v. *KK*] rather than flat, but Sen. is more concerned to point the contrast with *rupem Hymetti*; cf. *Phoen* 63, where *in plana tendis?* contrasts with the following *praerupta appetis?*" For *planus* in such a contrast, Zw. adds Stat. *Theb*. 4.179 *planaque Messene montosaque nutrit Ithome*.

***Pha* 25**

For *litus* denoting the edge of the water rather than the land, see above on *Tro* 837.

***Pha* 62f.**

My arguments for deletion of *nunc veloces figis dammas leviore manu* are given at *SA* 60. *Dammae* are "domestic quarry" (Mynors on V. *Georg*. 3.410), out of place in this list of creatures that are exotic by nature or remote location or both. Contra, *KK* argues that the group of three (*leones, cervas, dammae*) matches the following trios (*tigres, bisontes, uri; Arabs, Garamans, Sarmata*). But one could equally well argue that a group of two (*leones, cervas*) would match the duos that precede (58–59) and follow (69–70).

***Pha* 71**

For *-que* adding a third alternative, Mayer compares *Pha* 907; cf. also *Tro* 841, 846 (this against Bentley's *-ve*).

Martindale 1977 501 believes the line was interpolated after 70, perhaps because Hyrcanians and Sarmatians were near neighbours: cf. *Herc* 778f., where mention of Centaurs triggered an associative interpolation about Lapiths. But an interpolator skilled enough to pen line 71 would surely have realised that it made no sense after 70; interpolated or not, the line belongs after 68, where Leo placed it. The line's divergence (about which Martindale complains) from the careful antitheses of the passage is intended to avoid excessive schematism by providing variation, and is exactly parallelled in that function by line 65.

Pha 81

The transmitted *fave* makes good sense: the baying of the hounds signals to Hippolytus that the hunt is on (82 *signum arguti misere canes*), so he makes a concluding appeal to Diana before starting out. Copyists and then editors, however, have thought that Hippolytus takes the baying rather as a sign (*signum*) of the goddess' favour, and have consequently written *faves* (recc.) or *favet* (Delrius). Stähli-Peter shows that this interpretation is improbable (in part because of the way *signum* is used elsewhere in STrag), and gives a full defence of the paradosis. I add against *faves* that *en* is rarely used in conjunction with a second-person indicative verb in STrag, for reasons of sense (only *Oed* 797 *tangis en ipsos metus*, where the usage is softened by the more familiar collocation *en ipse*).

Pha 88

I take *pervium* (ETP) as proleptic, and *rostris* as dative.[1] Nereus is said to cut paths for ships, though actually they cut them for themselves; similarly the town of Sparta is said to exercise young women, though in reality they exercise themselves (*Med* 77–79). In similar contexts indicating place, Memnon is said to "mingle the Tigris with the sea" (*Tro* 11), and the Acharnian is said to "soften the frosts" (*Pha* 21) of his neighbourhood. What is common to these passages is that, in a listing of places, an action is attributed by transference to an agent that does not actually perform it.[2]

Pha 95

For allusive references to mythical figures see above on *Tro* 45f.; for participles used in such references cf. *Ag* 15 *ille celeri corpus evinctus rotae* (= Ixion), and see above on *Phoen* 320. The terseness of *revulsam*, which has caused doubts about the text (Martindale 1977 502), perhaps reflects the fact that Phaedra's point is not Proserpine's own identity, but rather the hubristic folly of stealing the partner of Dis' throne. Compare the impersonality of *praelatam*, "the one preferred," at *Oct* 195 (see ad loc.).

---

[1] Many discussions of the lines are listed by Zw. 1977 162 fn. 70. Since then, Watt 1996 250f. has conjectured *quidquid Assyria tenus/tellure Nerei pervium rostris iacet*, where *Nerei* is a partitive genitive.

[2] Substitution of person for place (v. Housman on Manil. 4.602) only partially explains the last two passages: to attribute the actions in question to Ethiopia or Acharnae respectively would still involve transference.

***Pha* 97**

There is no need to revive Bentley's alteration of *-que* to *-ve* here, any more than at 71. Items may be linked by *et* or *-que* after an initial negative, cf. 488 *non aura populi et vulgus infidum bonis*, 522, 531, *Ag* 615–17 *quam non Pelei Thetidisque natus/ carusque Pelidae nimium feroci/ vicit.*

***Pha* 115**

Phaedra's self-correction, to the effect that her passion is more hopeless than Pasiphae's, is explicit at 119 *sed amabat aliquid.* Axelson, however, followed by Zw., begins it in 115, by placing a question-mark after *genetrix, tui me miseret.* This certainly gives additional rhetorical point to 115–18, but I hesitate to adopt an interpretation which would be unclear without modern punctuation. Furthermore, Phaedra's pity for her mother is hardly so well established in 113 by the single word *miserae*, that it can be called into question in 115. In fact lines 113–14 are concerned chiefly, albeit obliquely, with acknowledging Phaedra's own passion, and at the same time excusing it as fated. Similarly Euripides' Phaedra at *Hipp.* 337 ὦ τλῆμον, οἷον, μῆτερ, ἠράσθης ἔρον is primarily trying to find a way of talking about her own passion.

***Pha* 118**

The phrase *ille ductor indomiti gregis* takes up *pecoris efferum saevi ducem* of two lines earlier, but now with an explanatory function: he was *torvus* as a dominant bull, *adulter* because a dominant bull is promiscuous, *impatiens iugi* because like the herd he was *indomitus* (the last a play on metaphorical and literal meanings). Since *ille* also refers back to 116, it is best taken as an adjective with *ductor*: "a brute lecherer, intolerant of the yoke, (was) that leader of the untamed herd." The traditional punctuation places a comma between *ille* and *ductor*, but this leaves *ductor indomiti gregis* as a description that weakly repeats 116.

***Pha* 123**

Following the protasis *non si ille remeet*, E offers *promittet*, A *promittat.* After a present subjunctive in the protasis, STrag has six instances of future indicative in the apodosis, and two instances of present subjunctive.[3] There is no clear distinction of meaning between the

[3] Future indicative: *Herc* 365, 503, *Tro* 547, *Med* 83, 525, *Pha* 811 (echoed 818f.).

two constructions; the two instances of present subjunctive in the apodosis may therefore be influenced by metrical convenience. Here there is no metrical advantage to using a subjunctive, so that *promittat* is probably an instance of A's tendency to write normative in place of idiomatic Latin.

Pha 186

N. Heinsius' conjecture *impotens* for EA *potens* is widely accepted; for a defence of *potens* see Hudson-Williams 1991 429. It is true that the burden of the passage is Cupid's *power*; *impotens* taken closely with *pollet*,[4] however, does not diminish that power but rather characterises it as unruly. This matches other characterisations of Cupid's power in 184f. both through the verb *dominatur* (cf. *Herc* 384 *dominare tumidus*, 395 *dominare ut libet*) and through the association of Cupid with *furor*, which rules Phaedra by conquest against reason.

Pha 216

The EA reading *vides* is already corrected to *vide* by a second hand in C. The imperative *vide* can carry the meaning 'consider, take thought' (*Med* 429, *Thy* 441), which fits the context well. *Vides* would be required by the context to mean 'you know, you understand,' which is not a usual meaning of the indicative forms of the verb (see on *Med* 171).

Pha 218

E has *puto*, A *fero*; Zw.'s arguments at *Rez.* 196f. against *fero* are persuasive. Later Zw. conjectured *reor* (1980 194f.) on the grounds that the first-person form *puto* is avoided in high poetry. But STrag is less exclusive of 'unpoetic' diction than some other forms of high poetry (my *Herc* comm. p. 185, Billerbeck 1988 80–87); Zw.'s thesis leads him to reject a unanimously transmitted *puto* at *Ag* 795 and *HO* 1303. Furthermore the hypothesis that an original *reor* was corrupted to *rero* (sic) and then 'corrected' to *fero* in A is dubious in

Phoen 61 *remittam* is probably a seventh instance in view of the future *auferet* in 56 (so *KK* here). Present subjunctive: *Pha* 614 (echoed 616), *Oed* 884. At *Oed* 1029 *rependam* is indeterminate.

[4] For *impotens* associated with a word indicating power cf. *Herc* 738f. *impotentis tyranni*, 966 *regnum impotens*, 1180 *impotens dominator, Tro* 215 *regno impotens*, 266f. *impotens regno, Med* 143 *sceptro impotens*.

itself and does not explain why *reor* was altered in E too. It seems more likely that A's *fero* is a deliberate alteration, made on the mistaken grounds that led Carlsson 1926 40f. to adopt the reading, namely that Phaedra endures and does not espouse love's sovereignty over her.

Pha 239

Some editors accept E's *haud* (A has *aut*, which hardly makes sense here), and attribute 239[b] with recc. to Phaedra, necessarily printing it as a question. But *haud* is rarely used in questions (K-S 1.814, H-S 453, cited by Watt 1996 251): the sole instance in STrag is *Oed* 1035 *quid illum nomine haud vero vocas?*, where *haud* pertains to the one word *vero*, not the whole question.

One alternative is to allow the Nurse's speech starting at 236 to include both 239[b] (so EA) and 240[a] *ferus est* (so A), with antilabe beginning in 240[b]; for the pattern cf. *Herc* 1186. But this is rhetorically lame, since a possible solution to Hippolytus' intractability, viz. *preces*, is more likely to be raised by Phaedra than by the Nurse. Much the best solution is to write *at* in place of *aut/haud*, with 239[b] as a statement by Phaedra: "But he can be overcome by prayers." Such an affirmation is in keeping with Phaedra's assertiveness in this section of the scene, where she insists that Theseus will not return (219–21), that it is her settled decision to pursue Hippolytus (*placet* 235), and that wild things can be overcome by love (240). For attribution of the conjecture *at* see *KK*; for *at* in second place cf. *Tro* 1085, Norden *Aeneis VI* Anhang III B 3.

Pha 244–45

These two lines are closely parallel in structure and sense. The Nurse threatens the arrival of an authority figure; Phaedra qualifies that person by allusion to a previous episode that diminishes the likelihood of punishment. For the obscure traditions glanced at in 245[b], to the effect that Minos did not punish Ariadne's elopement with Theseus as sternly as he might have done, see Mayer ad loc. and, in more detail, Mayer 1990 402f. Leo, apparently unaware of these traditions, inserted a comma after *mitis*, viz. "He will be lenient, because his other daughter was also involved in a love-affair" (so Woesler). Not seeing a close parallel between 244[b] and 245[b], Leo also printed a question-mark after 244[b]. But Mayer's explanation of 245[b] restores the parallel and makes parallel punctuation desir-

able. *Nempe* need not indicate a question (e.g. *Tro* 340, 744, *Ag* 702, *Thy* 411).[5]

Pha 259f.

For the sequence of three alternative questions, the last two introduced by *an . . . an*, cf. *Thy* 1032f. *utrumne saevis pabulum alitibus iacent,/ an beluis vorantur, an pascunt feras?* There is no need to divide the sequence by placing a question-mark at the end of 259.

Pha 261

On the transposition of this line after 252, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 298f.

Pha 264

On this interpolated line see below on *Ag* 934.

Pha 275–77

Miller in his translation makes line 276 qualify *iste puer* in 277, as does the OCT by placing a colon at the end of 275, but this is against the natural run of the Latin. The motive is presumably to attribute the archery of 276 to just one of the Cupids, since *iste puer* is singular. Perhaps a better solution is to take Eros and Anteros as twin aspects of one boy; so Herrmann paraphrases *geminus Cupido* as "Cupidon dont la nature est double," and Boyle translates, "dual Cupid."

Pha 277

E has *et renidens*; the false word-division *acre nitens* in A points to an original *ac renidens* in that tradition (so Kunst 1924 2.72). Displacement of *ac* by the more common *et* (see above on *Tro* 1036) may have occurred here in E under the influence of *et* in the same position in the previous line.

Pha 326

EA have *ditique ferax Lydia regno* (*regni* CS); sense requires correction to *ditisque* (recc.) *f. L. harenae* (Grotius). Zw. 1977 163–64 prefers to

---

[5] For possible interpretations of 244^b see Mayer ad loc. In view of the parallelism with 245^b, the most likely interpretation is that indicated by Farnaby's gloss on *nempe Pirithoi comes*: "Adulteri, atque hinc in me facilior futurus est."

write *ditique f. L. harena* because of the transmitted ablative, but that ablative probably represents an attempt to make sense of the corrupt reading "rich kingdom," viz. as an ablative of description. There is no certain instance of an ablative dependent on *ferax* before Stat. *Theb.* 7.308, though possible earlier instances are listed in *OLD* s.v. 2a (add Ov. *Am.* 2.16.7).

Elision such as *Lydia harenae* is uncommon in the second metra of anapaestic dimeters, but less stringently avoided in the putatively early plays, including *Pha* (cf. 31, 1137), than elsewhere in STrag: see Appendix §2.

Pha 328

On the lacuna and supplement see *SA* 64.

Pha 341–50

Leo's needless transposition of 343f. after 348 unfortunately encouraged later critics to exercise their ingenuity in re-ordering this list of animals. Zw. 1980 186–88 offers two reasons (at least) for rejecting the perfectly adequate line-order of EA.

1. The foreign tigers of 345 interrupt a list of non-exotic beasts, *iuvencus, cervi, aper*. Wrong categories! The tigers in fact introduce a new category, 'beasts dangerous to humans,' as signalled by *India horret* and *vulnificos dentes; tunc . . . tunc* reinforces the parallel between tigers and boars, and is then varied for the third item, lions (to *cum movit amor*) in a familiar Senecan pattern, e.g. 63ff. *tibi . . . tibi . . . et.*
2. The flurry of issues raised by Zw. about line 350 seems to centre on the point that the forest should be identified (cf. e.g. *Thy* 732 *silva Armenia*), and/or that Punic lions belong in open country (cf. *Oed* 919). But *Poeni* is a sufficient indication of locality, and Punic lions are associated with *silvae* at V. *Ecl.* 5.28.

The problems created by Zw.'s re-arrangement are evident: it loses the parallelism of *tunc virgatas . . ./tunc vulnificos . . .*; it attributes the forest-filling roar of 350 to the boar, the least vocal of the land-creatures mentioned; and it requires alteration of *tum* (350) to *tunc.*

Pha 364f.

Phaedra's eyes (a) are fiery, and (b) cannot endure the daylight. It is not sufficient to define (a) as a symptom of passion (*KK*) or excite-

ment (Mayer): rather both (a) and (b) are symptoms of a psychosomatic malady, whose other physical symptoms are detailed throughout this speech. Consequently the *et* linking the two is not adversative (as claimed by *TLL* 6.1767.69 followed by *KK*); indeed the relationship of (a) to (b) may be causative, i.e. the fire wearies her eyes so that they cannot tolerate light.

Nor is there any need to detect an inconsistency with 379f. *et qui ferebant signa Phoebeae facis/oculi nihil gentile nec patrium micant* (*pace* Mayer ad loc.). Once Phaedra's eyes shone in a way that betokened her descent from the Sun, but now they do not; indeed they cannot endure the sunlight, and such gleams as they manifest are from a more destructive fire.

Pha 367

Commentators tell us to take *ut* with *moriens*, "as if dying," but this seems wellnigh impossible. *Ut* used without a finite verb ('as if,' 'like') is regularly followed immediately by the word it qualifies, *Herc* 66, *Med* 886 *ut iussus, Oed* 695 *ut nocens*, *Ag* 539, 963 *ut vidua, Thy* 87, 264 *ut fracta*. Consequently *ut* is naturally taken here with *soluto*, "as if with weakened stance." Hence Axelson corrected *moriens* to *marcens*: for *marceo* of the effect of passion cf. *Ag* 183. Since *solvo* is familiar in the sense 'weaken, slacken' (*OLD* s.v. *solvo* 8, *solutus* 5), it is admittedly surprising to find it qualified here by *ut*; one may, however, compare *Herc* 712, where *quietus*, though frequently used elsewhere of waters, is softened into *quieto similis*.

Zw. printed *marcens* in his first OCT but reverted to *moriens* in the 1991 printing, justifying it by citing *Lydia* 22 *at mihi tabescunt morientia membra dolore*. But while a lover may speak passionately of dying from love-distress, such hyperbole is out of place in this relatively objective account by the Nurse, particularly as she qualifies even the weak metaphor *soluto* with *ut*. The latter objection applies also to Bentley's proposal to replace *gradu* with *genu*, which strengthens the metaphorical force of *soluto* but still leaves it weaker than *moriens*.

Pha 372–73

Habitus is a general word that can cover both demeanour and dress (though I could not catch both in translation): the *editio Lemairiana* rightly comments, "mutatur secundum modos aut vestiendi, aut standi, aut recubandi." (In the imitation at *HO* 250 *nec unus habitus durat* context limits the reference to demeanour.) I would not, however,

take *habitus* as accusative of respect with the *Lemairiana* and Boyle, since that construction is rare with finite verbs in STrag (above on *Tro* 296 fn.); the phrase is enlivened if Phaedra's *habitus* is personified as *impatiens sui* (as e.g. her *dolor* is personified in 366).

Pha 377–78

Leo's deletion of this couplet is justified by the degree to which it repeats and paraphrases 374[b]–76, as detailed by Kunst and by Zw. (*KK*). Wagenvoort 1919 365f. defends the couplet in a backhanded way, by characterising the whole speech as a repetitive jumble: "Senecae describendi ratio vix minus vaga est minusque sibi constat quam Phaedrae qui describitur animus vultusque." In particular he notes that face and eyes (363–65) recur at 376, 379–80.[6]

But the speech actually has a clear tripartite structure:

a) extended metaphor of fire (360–65[a])
b) changeable behaviour (365[b]–73[a])
c) loss of health (373[b]–80).

Section (b) is introduced by the general statement *nil idem dubiae placet*, and section (c) by the general word *salutis*. Face and eyes, then, are a focus of both (a) and (c), but with differing significance in the two sections. It seems unlikely that faltering steps would be mentioned twice under the *same* rubric (c), as happens if 377–78 are retained.

With deletion of 377–78, we have a natural transition in both (a) and (c) from face to eyes; furthermore the *et* at the beginning of 379 now convincingly links negations of Phaedra's usual appearance (*non* 374, *non* 375, *nihil* 380). I take 381–83 as a pendant to this focus on 'eyes,' introducing imagery of water to match that of fire in (a). Billerbeck *SSU* 107, who of course accepts 377–78 as genuine, is thereby forced to take 379–83 as a separate topic, a step which disregards the obvious relevance of 379–80 to the theme of health.

Pha 398

I first followed Zw. and others in deleting this line, but Williams 1992 143–45 has changed my mind. Kunst's punctilious objection,

[6] Wagenvoort also claims that "non solum versu 374 sed etiam vs. 367 fere idem enuntiatur quod versu 377 legimus." Not true: there is no indication of *walking* in 367, where *gradus* clearly means 'stance' (*OLD* s.v. 2).

that Phaedra should not blurt out Hippolytus' name in this public context, is answered by Williams; in fact there is nothing overtly improper in her reference to Hippolytus, and indeed *severi*, while chiefly connoting austerity, might be read as intended to forestall any notion that she could have a sexual interest in him (cf. *OLD* s.v. *severus* 2a). On the thematic significance of *mater Hippolyti* see Williams; note also that, as a revelation of where Phaedra's thoughts lie, this phrase is parallelled by *Hippolyti pater* at 98.

Zw. *Rez.* 190 fn. 11 found it impossible that Phaedra should compare herself to an anonymous Amazon leader *after* comparing herself to Antiope. But perhaps the sequence of thought is associative: mention of Antiope makes her think of the Amazons who invaded Attica (n.b. *Atticum pulsans solum* 400) after Theseus took Antiope there. Phaedra will be like Antiope in appearance, and like some other Amazon leader in riding vigorously over Attic soil.

Pha 404–30

Speaker-attributions here are controversial. EA give the prayer 406ff. to the Nurse, which entails that 404–05 must belong to the Chorus (as in E).[7] But Friedrich 1933 24–38 proposed a rearrangement in which 404–05 are addressed by the Nurse to Phaedra, 406–26 are spoken by Phaedra, and 427–30 are self-address by the Nurse. This proposal related to his analysis of the Act as a *contaminatio* of Euripides' extant *Hippolytus* (the basis of Sen.'s lines 387–403) with his earlier, now lost *Hippolytus* (allegedly the basis of the remainder of Sen.'s Act). The evidence (see Mayer on 406–22) does indeed suggest that Phaedra appealed to the moon in the earlier *Hippolytus*. But could Sen. not have transferred her prayer to the Nurse, in keeping with the more active role given to the Nurse in his play?

Friedrich's reassignment of speeches, though later tacitly dropped by Friedrich himself (*Euripides und Diphilos* 122), has been taken up by others including Coffey, Vretska, Mayer and Fantham.[8] A thorough

---

[7] A's assignment of 404 to the Nurse is clearly a deviation from the paradosis, as is its placement of 405 after 359. It would be a mistake to place any reliance on A here.

[8] M. Coffey, *Lustrum* 2 (1957) 164–65; H. Vretska, "Zwei Interpretationsprobleme in Senecas *Phaedra*," *WS* N.F. 2 (1968) 153–70, especially 153–61; Mayer's commentary ad 404–30. E. Fantham in *QCTC* 11 (1993) 161–69 would have alternate sections of the prayer spoken by Phaedra and the Nurse. Williams 1992 148–49 defends the attribution of the prayer to the Nurse on the grounds of its content.

assessment of the question could only be made in the context of a full-scale examination of Sen.'s sources and his use of them, which cannot be undertaken here. It is worth noting, however, that Friedrich's heavily analytical investigation, while conducted with acumen and learning, tended to overemphasise Sen.'s reliance on sources, and to underplay his ability to adapt them to new contexts. The prejudice involved in such an approach becomes entertainingly evident in Mayer's commentary. Zintzen and Zwierlein, while adopting analytical approaches, did not find it necessary to reassign these lines.[9]

My purpose here is to note Kragelund's important hypothesis of a scene-change, from the city to the country, after line 405.[10] This hypothesis sheds so much light on the play that it must be correct in my view. It explains, for example, why Hippolytus is surprised at 431–34 by the Nurse's arrival, which would not be surprising if the setting were the palace in Athens. Similarly it explains the Nurse's phrase *perferte in urbem* (733), "carry the news (or 'carry her') *to the city*." Division of Act 2 into two scenes is parallelled in *Tro*, where the break occurs after line 202. We may, then, recognise *Pha* 405 *agreste placa virginis numen deae* as motivating an exit and the end of Scene 1. For prayer and sacrifice as motives for exits in tragedy, see my comm. on *Herc* 515; *agreste* functions like *silvestria* at *Herc* 915, to suggest the setting of the proposed worship. While recognition of the the scene-change does not settle the attribution of 404–30, it must be added to the many factors relevant to that issue.

Pha 411

Zw. calls A's *alterna face* a normalising interpolation, whereas Mayer regards E's *alterna vice* as a trivialisation: either view could be right. E's phrase might be seen as awkwardly implying that the world is lit *only* when the moon's turn comes, whereas A's *alterna face* neatly implies the existence of another *fax*, the sun's.

---

[9] C. Zintzen, *Analytisches Hypomnema zu Senecas Phaedra* (Meisenheim 1960); Zw., *Senecas Phaedra und ihre Vorbilder* (Wiesbaden 1987). My own view, that Sen. combines elements from earlier depictions of Phaedra into an essentially new portrait, is stated briefly in the Loeb vol. 1, p. 442, and argued in detail in Fitch 1974 19–46.

[10] P. Kragelund, "Senecan Tragedy: Back on Stage?" *C&M* 50 (1999) 235–47, specifically 239–43. In the first printing of the Loeb I suggested a scene-change after 403, but placement after 405 is clearly preferable.

Pha 416

The transmitted *innecte* is already simplified to *inflecte* in MSS known to Ascensius. Delrius imaginatively defended *innecte* as a hunting metaphor: "vult Hippolyti animum in amoris retia pertrahi. aptum vocabulum venatrici et venatori." But unfortunately the verb does not mean 'ensnare.' If correct here, *innecte* must mean 'bind, fasten,' with a suggestion of Hippolytus as prisoner (cf. Col. 11.1.22 *ut sint diligenter compedibus innexa* [*mancipia*]).[11] That this metaphor does not particularly blend with surrounding metaphors is hardly a strong argument for altering the paradosis.[12]

Pha 418

The intriguing and paradoxical expression *te vultus ferant*, "may your face carry you along," is clarified by the fact that the "face" in this case is the moon itself. (For the moon as Diana's face cf. e.g. V. *Georg.* 1.430 *at si virgineum suffuderit ore ruborem.*) Bothe's proposal to replace *vultus* with *currus* smacks of normalisation. Watt 1989 334 would replace *te ferant* with *se ferant*, "may your countenance move along shining," but one is reluctant to disrupt the anaphora of *te* (418, 420, 422), which picks up *tuas* (417) and is appropriate in a prayer (Norden *Agnostos Theos* 149ff., Nisbet & Hubbard on Hor. *Carm.* 1.10.9).

Pha 420

Hudson-Williams 1989 190 rightly notes that *regentem frena* here has both a literal reference to guiding the reins of the chariot, and a wider metaphorical reference to wielding control over the night sky.

Pha 423

It makes good sense to take *ades* as imperative and read *fave* with E: as a result of Hippolytus' arrival, the Nurse needs the goddess' support immediately, and so she makes a last-minute appeal reinforcing her prayer. Compare note on 81 above, where there is a similar sequence. Some editors read *favet* (A) or *faves* (recc.), explaining that

---

11 Koetschau at *Philologus* 61 (1902) 141 interprets "bind his mind [to Phaedra's]," but this is too much to understand.

12 Nor would adoption of *inflecte* produce a more consistent sequence of metaphors. Though *inflecto* is once used of turning a horse's head (Sil. 9.646), it is an exaggeration to say that *doma, mitiga* and *inflecte* all "look to the management of animals" (Mayer).

the Nurse interprets Hippolytus' arrival as an answer to her prayer.[13] But three lines later she attributes his opportune arrival to chance (*casus* 426), not divine intervention. Furthermore her prayer was not that Hippolytus would arrive, but that he would listen favourably and be converted; the question whether the goddess will favour that prayer is not yet answered.

Pha 439

Poenis has the sense here of 'sufferings, ordeals' (cf. e.g. *Tro* 973), a meaning not recognised by *OLD*; v. *Herc* 604 with my commentary, where I mistakenly cited this line as 399.

Pha 452

The transmitted *duxit*, if correct, is best taken as an historic rather than a present perfect (i.e. 'led' rather than 'has led'), since if Sen. had wanted a present reference in this clause, he would surely have used a present tense. But the two clauses in 451[b]–52 do not envisage a quasi-historical or quasi-mythical event as clearly as 466–68. On balance it seems preferable to take *descripsit* as a present perfect, and to write *ducit* with recc.; in that case *ducit* has been assimilated in transmission to the tense of *descripsit* (so Kunst).

Pha 508

The transmitted phrase *sedesque mutat* is puzzling. If taken as a summary of 505–07 it is not only flat but also inappropriate, since Hippolytus does not *dwell* in these places but passes through them. No other interpretation offers itself, and the only conjecture close to the paradosis, Leo's *sedesque mutas*, is ruled out by the arguments given in the first paragraph of Zw.'s discussion. The original may therefore have been somewhat or completely unlike the paradosis.[14]

A suitable pendant to 507 would be a reference to the spring's cooling effect on the atmosphere of the grove, along the lines of *et sedat aestus* or *aestusque sedat*.[15] (Alternative verbs would include *vincit*

---

[13] So e.g. Mayer (though he assigns 406–26 to Phaedra): "Phaedra at once notices that her prayer is answered."

[14] *Mutare sedes* occurs at *Med* 448, but there is no obvious reason why that phrase should have intruded into the present context.

[15] For *sedo* with comparable nouns cf. Prop. 3.19.5 *flamma . . . sedetur*, Ov. *RA* 117 *sedare incendia*.

and *minuit*.) Axelson suggested *solesque vitat* (sc. Hippolytus), but there is awkwardness in linking this clause to 506 after an intervening clause (507) with a different construction and subject. Kenney therefore proposes to take Lerna as the subject of *solesque vitat*: "Lerna preserves her coolness by avoiding sunlight under a canopy of trees" (Mayer). But "avoiding the sun" is regularly an activity of humans, as Zw.'s second paragraph illustrates.

Pha 508

Fremo is rarely used of birdsong (*TLL* 6.1282.44 cites only this passage), and the similarity of *tremunt* directly below raises the possibility of corruption (so Mayer). Perhaps, however, the connotations of disorganised noise (*OLD* s.v. *fremo* 2b) and loud volume (*OLD fremitus* 3) account sufficiently for *fremunt* here. Words describing birdsong often strike us as oddly uncomplimentary, not least *querulus* here (cf. *OLD queror* 4): note *obstrepit* and *stridula* used of the nightingale's song (respectively Prop. 2.20.6, Sen. *Herc* 146).

Pha 508–10

E's *hinc* in 508 is almost certainly original against A's *hic*.[16] Zw. argues rightly that this *hinc* points to loss of a line or lines after 509 that contained a matching *hinc*. The odd pairing of *rami* and *fagi* in the paradosis strengthens the likelihood of a lacuna. The lost material will have contained the correlative *hinc*, a verb, and the name of one or more tree species in the nominative (not the genitive, *pace* Mayer).

Pha 521

Axelson and Zw. show that *versare* (*membra* etc.) belongs in descriptions of *troubled* sleep, i.e. the opposite to that being described here. I think it likely, therefore, that *versantem* originated in an explanatory gloss along the lines of *certior quam somnus eorum qui sollicita membra versant in purpura*. (See 'glosses, intrusive' in the index.)

---

[16] An original *hinc*, preserved in E, is altered to *hic* in A, whether deliberately or accidentally, at *Oed* 121, *Thy* 668, *HO* 797. The opposite change in A, from an original *hic* . . . *hic* to *hinc* . . . *hinc*, is probably deliberate at *HO* 395f.; the case at 1619f. is less clear.

Pha 558f.

For the conjecture *mitior nulla est feris* for EA *mitius nil est feris*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 309. Another possible conjecture is *mitius genus est feris*, "the brood of wild beasts is gentler," which would echo Ov. *Her.* 10.1 *mitius inveni quam te genus omne ferarum.* For the pattern of the fifth foot cf. *Tro* 43 *Troia iam vetus est malum.* There is no obvious explanation, however, for the displacement of *genus* by *nihil*, though both words are subject to abbreviation in MSS.[17]

Alternatively it may be that *nihil* is original and *mitius* is intrusive. Sen. may have written something like *impares nil sunt feris*, "they are every bit a match for wild beasts." This could have elicited a gloss making the reference to cruelty explicit, e.g. *vel fera mitior est; mitior* then intruded into the text and was assimilated to *nil.* This scenario offers an explanation of the corruption, but gives little help in recovering the original.[18]

Mayer comments, "S. might have written either *melius ingenium est feris* (cf. Ov. *Am.* 2.10.26 *turpe erit, ingenium mitius esse feris*), or *nulla non melior fera est* (= *H.O.* 236)." Other possibilities that occur to me along the lines of the second suggestion are *vix fera est immitior* or *saevior nulla est fera.* All these possibilities move further from the paradosis than *mitior nulla est feris*, without offering in compensation an explanation of the corruption.

How does *sed* at the beginning of 559 relate to what precedes? In the account of society's deterioration beginning at 540, women have a minor role. But the mention of women's crimes triggers Hippolytus' obsessive misogyny (illustrated in 566–68), and so he amends his account in order to make women the root cause. *Sed* could therefore be translated 'but actually,' i.e. "although I mentioned women last, and softpedalled on stepmothers, yet women are actually the source of all evil." To start a new paragraph in 559 with Zw. might obscure this sequence of thought.

Pha 596

Axelson and subsequent critics do not justify their suspicions of the transmitted *amavimus nefanda*, which are however justifiable. First,

---

[17] According to Giardina, E and P here have *nichil*, while CS have *$n^{i}l$*.

[18] Conjectures which interpret *nihil/nil* here as used adverbially with a comparative adjective or adverb are perilous: see my discussion in *Phoenix*. Hendry 1998 proposes *taceo novercas: mitius nil sunt feris*, which, as the saying goes, ain't grammar; it is intended to mean, "they are a thing no gentler than beasts."

nefanda sorts awkwardly with *amavimus*, falling halfway between direct object and adverbial (cognate) accusative. Second, Phaedra's original passion for Hippolytus is not enough *per se* to commit her irrevocably; the situation echoes Ov. *Met.* 9.626 *denique iam nequeo nil commisisse nefandum*, where the *nefandum* includes the actions Byblis has taken in *furtherance* of her passion. Axelson's conjecture *admovimus*[19] for *amavimus* is improved by Watt 1996 251 to *iam movimus*, which is convincing paleographically and yields an appropriate sense, "I have already set in motion," viz. by falling in love, allowing the Nurse's approach, and committing myself to an approach. As Watt notes, "*iam* goes well with *serus*, and *movimus* is picked up by *coepta*."

Pha 618

The line has been questioned on the grounds of inappropriate sense and unusual elision (*te imperia*): see *KK*. STrag has no other example of *me*, *te* or *se* elided in the first position of a trimeter. There is no serious objection to the sense, however, once one allows for Senecan pleonasm and variation (so *SSU* 107f.). The elision should therefore be accepted as a rarity but authentic. Sen.'s usage regarding elision varies from play to play: in trimeters, *Phoen* has four instance of *me* or *te* elided at the beginning of a foot (6, 207, 443, 488) while the other plays have only two between them (*Ag* 933 and here); in anapaests, the Group 1 plays have seven instances of elision in the second metron (four in *Pha*), while the other plays have none (see Appendix §2).

Pha 636

Prayers can be framed silently in the mind or heart, e.g. Ov. *AA* 1.602 *sed "male sit" tacita mente precare "viro," Her.* 13.89f *tacitoque in pectore dixi/ "signa reversuri sint, precor, ista viri!"* Phaedra has framed such silent prayers, and now Hippolytus is to hear them (*exaudi*), i.e. she is going to give them voice. *Quid simplicius?*[20]

---

[19] Axelson's *admovimus* was intended to mean "I have brought it close to occurring" (see *KK*). But this reference (less than clear in the Latin) to what is *imminent* does not fit Phaedra's argument, viz. that she is already committed to a certain course by her *past* action (594–95). Zw. relinquished Axelson's conjecture in the 1991 OCT p. xii, comparing *Ag* 108–15.

[20] Mayer oddly cites Shackleton Bailey's note on Prop. 4.7.21 concerning *tacitus* = 'secret, not spoken *about*,' which can hardly be relevant here. Confusion increases when Mayer adds an instance of *tacitus* used of 'low, stealthy' utterance, which cannot be the meaning here in view of *mentis*.

Pha 641–44

In *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 309f. I argued that E's text is correct, except that the clearly corrupt *ferit* in 641 needs to be emended: I proposed *errat*. R. Scott Smith 2002 suggests *serpit*, which is paleographically closer; that verb is used of real fire in the body at *Med* 818f. *imas/ urat serpens flamma medullas*, and of the metaphorical fire of love Ov. *Rem.* 105 *interea tacitae serpunt in viscera flammae*. I now feel less sure, however, that a verb of motion is required to correspond to the simile of 644; Gronovius' *saevit* matches the suggestion of intensity in *percurrit*, and *saevio* is used of love at *Med* 136 *saevit infelix amor*. Cf. *Oct* 173, where *saeviens* (Baehrens) is a probable conjecture for A's *fervens*.

Pha 644

The phrase *altas . . . trabes* probably refers to standing timber, cf. *Thy* 674 *excelsae trabes* (again in a fire), *Ben.* 3.29.5 *aspice trabes . . . altissimas*. It is often taken to mean high roofbeams (e.g. Herrmann, Boyle), and Mayer compares Lucr. 2.191f. *nec cum subsiliunt ignes ad tecta domorum/ et celeri flamma degustant tigna trabesque*. But there is no indication here that the setting is a house, and *percurrit* applies better to timber than roofbeams.

Pha 648f.

Mayer questions the coupling of the subjunctive *signaret* with the indicative *vidit* after *cum*. But Carlsson 1926 65 explains the variation: "mit *signaret* wird ein Zustand, mit *vidit* and *collegit* eine einmalige Handlung bezeichnet." There is a similar instance, with a similar significance, at *Med* 355–60 *mulcerent . . . coegit* (admittedly with *cum* repeated between the verbs); cf. also *HO* 168–69 *stetit . . . insereret*. Mayer writes *signarat*, but there is no instance of a pluperfect indicative following *cum* in STrag.

Pha 654–55

The paradosis has *tuaeve* at the beginning of 654 and *tuusque* at the beginning of 655. Bothe's alteration to *tuaeque . . . tuusve* was adopted in the 1986 OCT (followed by Boyle and Mayer) but discarded in 1991. To write *tuaeque* has the unfortunate effect of making *vultus* a second and inappropriate subject of *inerant lacertis; tuaeve* is preferable since it leaves 654 as a separate clause with *erat* to be understood. For *-que* with *potius* in 655 cf. *Thy* 522. Here *-que* implies that *tuus*

is not so much a rejection as a refinement of the comparisons in 654; this implication is in keeping with Phaedra's cautiously incremental transition from describing Theseus' beauty to describing Hippolytus'.

Pha 726

For *nefandi . . . stupri* Mayer conjectures *nefando . . . stupro* (dative with *instat*), but Watt 1996 252 defends the paradosis. For *raptor* with sexual connotations used with an objective genitive v. *OLD* s.v. 2.

Pha 755

The arguments for Axelson's palmary emendation *temperans* are explained in *KK*. I would add that the details of lines 753–56 are chosen to suggest a combination of comeliness and power, a combination found also in the ode to Bacchus in *Oed* 403ff. Comeliness is denoted by the youthful unshorn hair, the *mitra* and horns (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 2.19.29f. *aureo/cornu decorum*); power by the conquest of India and control of tigers. In the ode to Bacchus, the *mitra* similarly denotes comeliness at *te <u>decet</u> . . . caput Tyria cohibere mitra* (*Oed* 412f.), where *cohibere* matches *cohibere* here; and a combination of fine appearance and power is found in *vidit aurato residere curru/veste cum longa <u>regeres</u> leones/omnis Eoae plaga vasta terrae* (424–26), where *regeres* supports *temperans* here. *Territans* (EA) is inappropriate to the context, putting Bacchus in the league of a Cerberus (*Herc* 783) or Fury (*Thy* 96). *KK* explains the corruption paleographically, but it was no doubt influenced also by the proximity of *tigres*, i.e. by a scribe's assumption that tigers need terrifying.

Pha 758

Mayer correctly calls this line not a prohibition but a negative purpose clause, "lest you grow vain, (let me tell you that)." The reason, which he does not provide, is that second-person prohibitions with *ne* in STrag regularly use an imperative, e.g. 222 *ne crede*, 993 *ne metue*, 1240 *ne metue*. Even in the third person, the two instances of *ne* + subjunctive in main clauses are wishes rather than commands, *Med* 510, *Thy* 749.

Pha 764–70

On the transposition of 768–769 after 763, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 299f.

***Pha* 783f.**

Zw. argues persuasively in *Proleg.* 33f. and *KK* 204 that A's version *lascivae nemorum deae/montivagive Panes* is metrically too sophisticated to be the work of an interpolator, and that the line found in E, *Panas quae Dryades montivagos petunt*, is an interpolation designed inter alia to regularise the metre (i.e. to replace both *lascivae nemorum deae* and *montivagive Panes*, though the former survived in E).[21]

***Pha* 788**

The transmitted reading is *et*, which makes good sense as 'beginning a confirmatory sentence' (*OLD* s.v. 2a); *en* (KQe) scarcely needs to be considered. For reasons of sense, *en* would not sit well with *nuper*: instances are found of *en nunc*, *en iterum*, *en tandem*, but Kershaw 249 knows of no instance anywhere of *en nuper*.

***Pha* 812**

Digitis . . . prioribus means forefingers (however interpreted) not fingertips (Mayer), v. D-S s.v. *amentum, OLD* s.v. *prior* 1c, *TLL* 10.2.1329.73 correcting 5.1.1127.49.

***Pha* 831**

For the conjecture *Theseo*, where *Thes o* is an adjective, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 310.

***Pha* 899**

The correct defence of the transmitted *parvis* against Dan. Heinsius' conjecture *patriis* is given by Paschalis at *CP* 88 (1993) 52–54. In support of *patriis*, N. Heinsius cited Ov. *Met.* 7.422f. *cum pater in capulo gladii cognovit eburno/signa sui generis*, where Aegeus similarly recognises Theseus' swordhilt. But Sen. reverses the relative importance of *ebur* and *signa*, and treats the (engraved) ivory itself as the token of identity, in view of *regale* and the appositional *decus*: *patriis* would therefore be superfluous. No parallels are cited in *KK* or *TLL* for corruption of *patrius* to *parvus*.

---

[21] Kunst ad loc. suggested that E's line is a "Besserungsversuch des Dichters" designed to regularise both metre and sexuality; he printed it as an authorial alternative to A's text. The line's verbal awkwardness, however, makes interpolation more likely.

***Pha* 900**

On the spelling of Axelson's conjecture *Aegaeae*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 310f.

***Pha* 909**

On adjectives in *-fer* and *-ger*, and on the choice here, see my comm. on *Herc* 1204.

***Pha* 964**

Zw. 1990 695 fn. 11 defends the E reading *cur tanta tibi*, citing *Oed* 670 and 767 for the long final *-i*.

***Pha* 965**

Busche's conjecture *vices*[22] for EA *vias* gives a more explicit introduction to the theme of change in the following lines, and may well be right. But it also creates a paradoxical phrase, since *vices* here will connote change (*OLD* s.v. *vicis* 7), whereas *perennes* indicates continuity. This element of paradox is not present in otherwise similar phrases, *Ag* 822 *ad solitas vices, Thy* 813 *solitae mundi periere vices, Med* 402 *certas mundus evolvet vices*. Elsewhere *perennis* qualifies the *cursus* of the fixed stars (Lucr. 5.79, Cic. *ND* 2.55), a word that is closer to *vias* than to *vices*.

Two questions arise concerning the line as transmitted.

1. Can the phrase *agitare vias* carry a suitable meaning? *Agere vias, iter* etc. is a standard usage (*TLL* 1.1382.69–1383.6), but normally of those actually taking the journey, which would here be the stars. Comparable phrases with *agitare* in Sen. are similarly used of those making the movements (*Herc* 879 *agitent choros* of dancers, *Ag* 452 *agitatque gyros* of a dolphin). If correct, the phrase *agitare vias* here transfers the activity from the stars to Nature, to stress her active involvement (conveyed also by *rapis* and *versas* above).
2. Is the paradosis consistent with the theme of change in the following lines? Probably so, in view of *agitare*, which connotes force and speed, and is therefore consonant with change (cf. Cic. *ND* 3.27 *Naturae . . . omnia cientis et agitantis motibus et mutationibus suis*). Similarly at the beginning of *de Providentia* Sen. speaks as if the

[22] *BPhW* 37 (1917) 254f.

> speed of the heavenly bodies were itself responsible for effects on earth: (*supervacuum est ostendere*) *hanc inoffensam velocitatem procedere aeternae legis imperio, tantum rerum terra marique gestantem.*

Since the paradosis is at least conceivably right, I prefer to retain it.

***Pha* 971**

Dehon 1992 257–59 maintains the view, which goes back at least to Farnaby, that the line refers to autumn. Mayer's view that the line summarises the whole year goes back at least to the *editio Lemairiana* ("de sapientissimo totius anni temperamento") and to Kunst, who cites Tac. *Germ.* 26. Is it not possible that Sen. saw both meanings?

***Pha* 1022–25**

For the transposition of these lines after 1015, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 300f.

***Pha* 1016**

On Damsté's transposition of this line after 1026, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 302.

***Pha* 1043**

Hudson-Williams 1989 191 points out that *arduos* is used proleptically with *tollit*, 'raised aloft.' For this proleptic use of *arduus* v. *TLL* 5.2.494.21–29, citing e.g. V. *Aen.* 5.278f. *sibila colla/arduus attollens, Georg.* 1.240f. (*mundus*) *arduus consurgit.* So interpreted, the line largely duplicates 1036. One also notes that 1043–44 lack the focus on the beast's *colouring* which is evident elsewhere thoughout 1036–45. Conceivably, then, these two lines are interpolated (perhaps another instance of collaborative interpolation?). If so, the interpolator knew his Ovid, since 1044 reworks elements of *Met.* 15.513 as Hudson-Williams notes.

***Pha* 1045**

On the grounds for preferring A's *rubenti* to E's *rubente*, see above on *Herc* 904.

***Pha* 1048**

The word *partem* is surprising, but sound. By its very inarticulateness it perhaps indicates the namelessness of this 'part' of the creature

(cf. 1267), which is given definition only by the surrrounding words *trahit* (viz. as trailing on the ground) and *squamosa* (viz. as scaly). Cf. V. *Aen.* 2.207 *pars cetera pontum/pone legit* (Laocoon's sea-serpents), also Sen. *Oed* 730 (a monstrous serpent).

Richter's replacement of *partem* with *caudam* names the 'part,' but it is difficult to imagine how so explicit a term could have been displaced by the inexplicit *partem.* Watt 1989 335f. conjectures *piscem* (which would presumably require adjustment of *immensam* to *-um*); for hybrid monsters ending in a fish cf. Hor. *AP* 4 *desinat in piscem*, Ov. *Met.* 4.727 *desinit in piscem* (Perseus' sea-monster), 13.915 and 963 (Glaucus).[23] But both *immensam* and *trahit* suggest the elongated, gradually tapering kind of tail frequently seen on hybrid marine monsters in ancient art—a tail that resembles a sea-serpent rather than a fish. Some fine examples, including a bull with such a tail, are found on the altar of Domitius Ahenobarbus.[24]

Pha 1054

A offers *metus*, E *metu.* For the genitive with *immunis* cf. e.g. *Epiced. Drusi* 55 *luctus*, Sen. *Vit. Beat.* 26.5 *vitiorum.* E's *metu* must be suspect here, since it could have been influenced by the presence of *metu* directly above it, and by the fact that *immunis* can be constructed with the ablative.

Pha 1069

It is not easy to choose between *rapuere currum* (EA) and *rapuere cursum* (recc.); Zw. makes a strong case for the latter. Perhaps *rapuere currum* better conveys a new development, in accordance with *protinus*: the horses "swept away" the chariot, i.e. they both seized control of it and carried it off forcefully. The phrase *rapere cursum*, on the other hand, conveys speed rather than sudden or violent action, v. *OLD* s.v. *rapio* 8^{b}. Zw. points out that *currus* in the accusative is always plural elsewhere in STrag: here perhaps the singular is used of the chariot (cf. *curru* 1088) because the plural *currus* (nom. or acc.) is used to denote (or at least to include) the horses at 1063 and 1075.

---

[23] Others similarly end in a *pristis*, ruled out here by the following simile: V. *Aen.* 3.427 (Scylla), 10.211 (Triton).

[24] See Heinz Kähler, *Seethiasos und Census: Die Reliefs aus dem Palazzo Santa Croce in Rom*, Monumenta Artis Romanae 6 (Berlin 1966); the bull is seen in Tafel 2. I am indebted for this reference, and for discussion of the issue, to J.P. Oleson.

***Pha* 1092**

Axelson's correction of EA *devio* to *devium*, "wandering off course" (sc. *Phaethonta*) is necessary, cf. *HO* 853f. *errantem . . . Phaethonta*. In most versions Phaethon is pulled off course after losing control of the horses (Gantz 32–33), but in STrag and *HO* he is an Icarus-like figure who drives off course through folly, *Med* 600 *immemor metae iuvenis paternae, HO* 679–81 *nec per solitum decurrit iter,/sed Phoebeis ignota petit/ sidera flammis errante rota*. Hence *devium* indicates a further reason, in addition to those of 1091–92, why the horses threw him.

***Pha* 1099**

I take *stipite eiecto* (A) to be the original reading, and E's unmetrical *stipite iecto* to be a corruption of it by haplography of *e*. The tree-stump holds Hippolytus impaled "with its stock thrust out right through his groin," i.e. passing through the groin and projecting from it. *Eicio* can mean 'thrust out, extrude, extend' (as distinct from the more common 'throw out, expel'), e.g. Cic. *de Orat*. 2.266 *eiecta lingua* (Stat. *Theb*. 2.681), Var. *R*. 1.31.3 (*sarmentum*) *neque ex se potest eicere vitem*, Plin. *Ep*. 2.17.11 *duo baptisteria velut eiecta sinuantur*, Balb. *grom*. p. 99 La. (*lineae*) *eiectae in utramque partem*. The vigour of the verb strengthens the evident sexual symbolism of the passage, which is recognised in the comments of Nisbet: "a bizarre caricature of Priapus . . . such is nature's revenge on chastity."[25]

Erecto, the reading of Trevet's MS, is either a corruption of or conjecture on A's *eiecto*; it enjoyed a run of over half a millennium as the vulgate until rightly set aside by Zw. It would be unexceptionable (though unnecessary) if it could mean simply 'upright' (so e.g. *ed. Lemairiana*, Boyle). With *per medium inguen*, however, it would have a strongly participial sense. Hudson-Williams 1989 191f. accurately translates, "the stump having risen up through the middle of his groin," and explains that with this reading the stump is "represented as risen upwards instead of the body being forced downwards by the impact." Both linguistically and symbolically this looks like a superfluous exaggeration of what is evident in the transmitted *eiecto*.

N. Heinsius' conjecture *ingesto* is further still from the paradosis. It is taken from *HO* 1449 *stipite ingesto*. There, however, *ingesto* signifies

[25] In *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble* (Bristol 1987) 247, quoted by Hudson-Williams 1989 192.

repeated blows (of the club). *Ingero* is, in fact. a word of quite specific denotations, which include heaping/pouring on (*OLD* s.v. 1: e.g. *Oed* 306, *Thy* 731); pouring in, i.e. ingesting (*OLD* 1c: *Oed* 196); pouring on multiple weapons or blows (*OLD* 2: *Thy* 731, cf. *HO* 1449); obtruding in a pushy or unwelcome way (*OLD* 3: *Herc* 1032, *Med* 132). None of these is apposite here.

Pha 1100

Deleted by Axelson followed by Zw., the line is defended by Billerbeck *SSU* 112f., Hudson-Williams 1989 192 and Mayer ad loc. Hudson-Williams sets a comma at the end of 1100 in place of the traditional full stop, to show that 1100 and 1101[a] are complementary statements, the second a succinct variation of the first.

Pha 1103

On the difficulties of syntax, and the possibility that *asperi* has displaced a verb such as *lancinant* or *dissipant*, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 311f.

Pha 1104

Lines 1102[b]–04 describe an ongoing process of wounding and dismemberment, as Hippolytus' body continues to be dragged along after the initial rupture (1102[a]). Dismemberment is indicated particularly in 1104, and clearly requires a substantial instrument; as a *truncus* began it, so *trunci* continue it. It is hardly necessary to consider Bentley's conjecture *ruscus* for *truncus*, commended by Zw.

Pha 1106–07

On the proposed deletion of these lines, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 312.

Pha 1114–22

Non quod amisi fleo (1122) is not a contradiction of *amissum fleo* (1117), as it appears at first, but a redefinition. Zw. gives a careful and generally persuasive account of the sequence of thought. Initially Theseus notes, with surprise, his instinctive grief and tears; the Messenger's challenges (1118, 1121) force him to redefine and justify his feelings. Grimal ad loc. helpfully compares *ad Marc.* 7–8, where Sen. states that Nature causes one's grief over a loss, but *opinio* determines its duration and character: here we see 'natural' grief immediately modified by *opinio*.

The focus of 1122 is different from that of 1117, and with it the

meaning of 'loss.' The focus of line 1117 is on time, with a contrast between the perfect *volui* and present *fleo*, and a secondary contrast between the atemporal *noxium* and the temporal *amissum*: "I desired to kill him as he was guilty, but now he is lost, I weep." In 1122, on the other hand, the focus is on cause: "My tears are for having killed him, not for having lost him."[26] So 'loss' is used with a more specific connotation of 'bereavement' in 1122 than in 1117.

***Pha* 1123**

Axelson brilliantly recovers the original *quanti casus heu magna rotant* from the transmitted *q. c. humana rotant.* This restores a needed antithesis with the content of lines 1124–25, and a needed point of comparison for *minor* in 1124. Other Fortune-odes similarly begin with those particularly endangered, *Ag* 57f. *O regnorum/magnis fallax Fortuna bonis, Herc* 524 *O Fortuna viris invida fortibus.*

To the arguments in *KK*, conclusive in themselves, I add that the correction restores, in *quanti/magna*, the kind of reciprocity found in 1124 *minor/parvis* and 1125 *levius/leviora.* For such reciprocity as a stylistic flourish at the opening of an ode cf. *Tro* 1009 *dulce maerenti populus dolentum, Oed* 980 *fatis agimur: cedite fatis, Ag* 808 *Argos nobilibus nobile civibus, Herc* 524 *O Fortuna viris invida fortibus* (the last auditory).

***Pha* 1140**

In sense this line fits well where transmitted: the section beginning at 1132 uses a sustained metaphor of lightning/thunder, first in reference to low and high in the natural world, then (after the central statement *metuens . . . petit*) in reference to low and high in the human world, viz. *plebeia domus* and *regna* respectively. Metrically 1140 is a short aeolic line with two syllables before the nucleus, such as Sen. uses at *Oed* 407 *Thebae, Bacche, tuae.* One would therefore expect to find it in an aeolic context such as 1128–31 rather than after the anapaests of 1132–39, but there is no justification in sense for transposing it. So it looks as if Sen., with his interest in metrical experiment and transformation (particularly in the Group 1 plays), is showing that this aeolic line is just like an anapaestic metron with

[26] There is a comparable distinction at Ov. *Met.* 8.492–93 (Althaea speaking of her son Meleager) *meruisse fatemur/illum cur pereat; mortis mihi displicet auctor.*

an extra syllable,[27] and can therefore be used appropriately after anapaests, especially as aeolics are not far distant.

Pha 1145

On the location of the lacuna, and on possible supplements, see *SA* 65.

Pha 1152

Most commentators indicate puzzlement over *casta*, explicitly or by silence. Mayer expounds correctly, "The Chorus seem to suggest that Athena might have had to recompense her uncle with her own virtue, a bizarre fancy." The chief point, however, lies in a complex of allusion and double meaning which has not been noted. The allusion is to Proserpine, who though chaste was subject to her uncle, V. *Aen.* 6.402 *casta licte patrui servet Proserpina limen*. In the account of her rape in Ov. *Met.* 5, her uncle (379) is called *raptor* 402 and *praedo* 521, cf. *rapta* 395, *rapienda* 416, *rapina* 492, *raptam* Sen. *Med* 12. *Rapaci* here refers not only to that kidnapping but also to Death's traditional rapacity and greed, cf. Call. *Epigr.* 2.6f. ὁ πάντων/ἁρπακτὴς 'Αίδης, Sen. *Pha* 467 *rapaces . . . Fati manus*, my comm. on *Herc* 291f. Finally *casta* may glance at the fact that Athena's 'replacement' for Theseus is the chaste Hippolytus (cf. 1241 *casti venimus*).

For 'filling out the number' of the dead (1153) cf. V. *Aen.* 6.545 *explebo numerum reddarque tenebris*, and for the notion of a replacement for Theseus cf. *Herc* 1339f.

Pha 1178

E has *Phaedram*, A *memet*. Mayer ad loc. finds it "hard to believe . . . that if *Phaedram* was authentic anyone would replace it with the pronoun." But copyists have difficulty in understanding speakers' references to themselves in the third person, and energetically eliminate such references, often by assigning the lines to another speaker.[28] An original *memet* would hardly be obscure enough to evoke a gloss, which Mayer thinks the source of *Phaedram*.

---

[27] But it is not simply an anapaestic monometer (*pace* Mayer ad loc.).

[28] Examples in E are cited in the note on 1199f. For examples in A see *Tro* 979 and my comm. on *Herc* 634–36 and 1237–39. *Pha* 138–39 represents an instance in the archetype. At *Med* 567 A alters a third-person self-reference into a second-person self-address.

***Pha* 1179f.**

Axelson and Zw. delete these two lines as inconsistent with the rest of the speech—a classic instance of rational criteria applied inappropriately to a passionate and irrational character. Phaedra is in fact consistent only in her inconsistency, her confusion of motives and her wildly veeering emotions: see in detail Fitch 1974 19–46. Zw.'s arguments are scrutinised critically by Lieberg in *Mus.Crit.* 21–22 (1986–87) 363–70, who comments rightly, "Tutta l'argomentazione dello Zwierlein si basa sul presupposto che Fedra in questo monologo finale non sia più la donna che appassionatamente ama Ippolito" (366).

***Pha* 1197**

"*Pectus patet mucrone*, nempe scissum & reclusum" (Gronovius): the phrase cannot mean "my breast is bare to the sword" (Miller).

***Pha* 1199f.**

These two lines are a continuation of Phaedra's speech in A, but the beginning of a speech by Theseus in E. The following considerations are in favour of A:

1. A leading cause of MSS error in speaker-attribution is scribes' failure to understand a third-person reference by a speaker to himself or herself. Leo 1.83 discusses this phenomenon and notes the following instances in E: *Ag* 288–91, 293^{b}, 295–301 given to the Nurse because of 301 *haec vacat regi ac viro; Thy* 920–37 given to the Chorus because of 937 *Thyesten; HO* 1863ff. given to the Chorus because of *Alcmenae*. So here *noverca* will have led to E's misattribution.
2. The two other runs of trochaic tetrameters in STrag are *Med* 740–51 and *Oed* 223–32. In each instance they *begin* a speech, and are followed by another metre in the same speech: that pattern supports A's arrangement here.[29]
3. Phaedra's anger at Theseus and desire to hurt him are evident

[29] Zw. believes that E's arrangement is the original, and that A has attributed 1199f. to Phaedra for metrical reasons, i.e. to attach these trimeters to the trimeters of Phaedra's speech. He does not give parallels for such scribal motivation; sense (as in point 1 above) seems a more likely motive than metre for a scribe to alter a speaker-attribution.

earlier in this speech at 1164–67 and 1190–94. *Disce a noverca*, spoken by Phaedra, would take up *peior noverca* at the beginning of the paragraph (1192) and suggest hurtfully that, as Theseus is 'worse' than Phaedra, so he should learn his duty from her.

4. Some critics prefer that Phaedra's dying words should be of recompense to Hippolytus (i.e. line 1198), "dans l'apaisement du sacrifice qu'elle lui offre" (Grimal ad loc.): "ein würdiger Abgang dieser Gestalt aus dem Leben und aus dem Drama" (*KK* ad loc., where Zw. even finds "greatness" in Phaedra here). In STrag, however, Last Words are more likely to express bitter hatred. Theseus curses Phaedra at the end of the play (1279f.); even the noble Polyxena dies *irato impetu* (*Tro* 1159); Medea underlines the father's loss of his sons (*Med* 1024 *recipe iam natos parens*, cf. here *rapto . . . nato parens*); cf. also *Ag* 1012, *Thy* 1110–12.
5. Act 5 can be analysed schematically (though not dramatically) as consisting of the reactions of Phaedra and Theseus successively to Hippolytus' death, and as containing many parallels between the two reactions. Both speakers begin, for example, by calling on sea-monsters to attack them and blaming Theseus (1159–63~1204–06, 1164–67~1208–10); both end with a reference to Athens and with decisive actions (1191, 1197f.~1275–78).[30] It seems likely, therefore, that the final couplet spoken by each should also be parallel, viz. a curse on the other spouse (cf. 1279f.).
6. It is unlikely that Theseus himself would think of 'learning' his duty from Phaedra at this moment.
7. For the pointed use of *disce* here cf. *Herc* 398, *HO* 991 *a matre disce*: both are addressed to an interlocutor, not to the speaker, and the latter refers to the speaker in the third person (*matre*).

Pha 1204

Axelson's correction of *nunc vastum mare* to *nunc vasti maris* is entirely convincing. The *variatio* of *ponti* by *maris* is typical of Sen's pleonasm, cf. particularly *Med* 411f. *procellosum mare/pontusve coro saevus*; use of *nunc . . . nunc* to enumerate near-synonyms is found at *Tro* 613 *nunc advoca aestus, anime, nunc fraudes, dolos*. See *KK* for these and other parallels cited by Axelson.

---

[30] Further parallels are noted by Mayer 187 following Zw. *Rez.* 22–24.

***Pha* 1207f.**

The relationship between 1207 and 1208 has caused doubts, but unnecessarily. Neptune is called upon to punish Theseus for causing Hippolytus' death. The phrase *semper irae facilis assensor meae* identifies the role in which Neptune is invoked, viz. as one who readily assents to Theseus' *ira* (i.e. his desire for vengeance and punishment: for this sense of *ira* see my comm. on *Herc* p. 25). *Semper* in particular denotes that the god is to comply with Theseus' *ira again*, since the only previous instance was Theseus' curse on Hippolytus. Line 1208 then conveys by implication Theseus' specific request, viz. for a painful death; *dignus haud sum* is no dispassionate assessment, but expresses a vehement desire for punishment, cf. 683 *sum nocens, merui mori*, *Oed* 878f. *iam morte dignus . . ./nunc aliquid aude sceleribus dignum tuis*.

Theseus' wish, then, that Neptune assent to his *ira* by punishing him with a painful death, is conveyed by implication through the juxtaposition of the two lines. For another instance of an implicit relationship between an invocation and what follows it, see 903–05; and for an invocation followed by a statement which takes the place of a request, cf. *Med* 71–74.

Bentley and Housman prefer to make the invocation of Neptune co-ordinate with the invocation of the sea-monsters in 1204f.: for this purpose Bentley transposes 1206 and 1207, while Housman (*Classical Papers* 1080) simply places a comma at the end of 1206 and a full-stop at the end of 1207. These changes, however, leave 1208–10 with no connection to what precedes, since *rapite in altos gurgites* is concerned with Theseus' removal rather than his torture; for this reason Mayer's silent adjustment of Housman's punctuation, replacing the full-stop at the end of 1207 with a colon, is not convincing.

***Pha* 1224**

Caelo remissum cannot mean 'sent/hurled *back* into the sky,' since 'back' would fit the tree but not Theseus.[31] *Remissum* must therefore mean 'released' (from whatever holds him and the tree to the ground), cf. *Phoen* 61, *Oed* 443.

[31] Hence some MSS have *remissa*, which however leaves *findat* without an expressed object.

Trabs often means 'treetrunk,' and that is its meaning in two Ovidian references to Sinis (*Met.* 7.441, *Ibis* 407). *In geminas trabes*, then, indicates that each half of the victim's divided body is pulled *towards* one of the two trunks, i.e. he is split between them (so e.g. Kunst, Grimal, Hudson-Williams 1989 429f.). Therefore the singular *pinus* of 1223, which has caused some confusion, must be a collective singular (cf. note on *Oed* 532–37 below).[32] There is a parallel use of a collective singular concerning a similar punishment at *Herc* 1210–12 *illa quae Pontum Scythen/Symplegas artat hinc atque hinc vinctas manus/distendat alto*, where the reference is clearly to *both* Symplegades. Other instances of the collective singular used where a plural reference is strong include *caput* of Cerberus' three heads at *Herc* 785 and 826 (contrast 784 *trina capita*, 825f. *omni cervice*), and the single bird masking the heavens at *Phoen* 422f. *atra nube subtexens diem/Stymphalis.*

In with verbs of division can mean 'into' (two or more parts), v. *OLD* s.v. *in* 19b. Because of this, and of the singular *pinus*, the phrase *in geminas trabes* has been taken to refer to the splitting of the body into two halves. This would be an extremely unusual metaphor, since *trabs* almost always refers to wooden objects.[33] It is also difficult to envisage the mechanics whereby a single pine both raises Theseus to the sky and splits him in half.

Pha 1263

Since *arentes* is proleptic, there should be no comma before it: Hudson-Williams 1989 192.

Pha 1270

Inimica has been taken, for want of a better explanation, as an allusion to Phaedra, with *flectens* in the sense 'attracting.' But Phaedra was not Hippolytus' enemy, nor would it be a fitting compliment at this point to his beauty to note that it attracted his stepmother (and so caused his death). The participle *flectens* suggests rather a regular characteristic, but the play gives no hint that Hippolytus had a series

---

[32] Grimal ad loc. has an ingenious alternative: "Un seul pin est courbé, mais le corps du supplicié est attaché d'un coté à la cime de celui-ci et. de l'autre, à un autre tronc qui fournit un point fixe."

[33] This is perceived by Watling, who translates, "Ripping a body in half, like a sawn plank." The phrase cannot mean simply "in two" (Miller et al.)

of enemies. *KK* concludes rightly that *inimica* is corrupt, and has displaced a word qualifying Hippolytus' eyes or gaze, with *flectens* in the sense 'directing.' Watt 1989 336 offers a persuasive replacement in *animosa*. That adjective appears 15 times in Ovid and five times elsewhere in STrag; in Sen's trimeters (four uses) it is always first word, and always in the form *animosa*.

Oed 2

Defenders of the paradosis explain *iubar* as synonymous with *Titan* and the subject of a clause co-ordinate with that in line 1. For this pattern they cite 958f., where *genae* and *oculi* are synonyms. But *iubar* lacks the element of personification in *Titan*: consequently when we reach *prospiciet* we have to retrieve *Titan* as the subject, which is unreasonably awkward.

The most economical correction is to write *maestus* for *maestum* with Gronovius, taking *iubar* as accusative of respect. For this construction with an adjective cf. e.g. *Pha* 302 *dulcior vocem*, *Oed* 538 *amara bacas laurus*, *Ag* 738 *colla sublimis*. The accusative of respect is often used with participles in combination with an ablative of means, e.g. *Herc* 499 *sanguine infectae manus*, 984f. *caput/serpentibus vallata*, *Tro* 559 *confossa telis pectus ac vinclis manus/. . . praestricta*, *Oed* 300 *colla depressam iugo*. It is likely, therefore, that *maestus* here has a quasi-participial sense, 'saddened by,' for which cf. *Ag* 772 *maestus futuro funere*. Other instances of adjectives used with acc. of respect and abl. of means are *Med* 14 *crinem solutis squalidae serpentibus*, *Thy* 734 *cruore rictus madidus*, 780 *madidus unguento comam*. If Gronovius' conjecture gives the correct text, it is closely echoed at *HO* 722f. *nulla nube respersus iubar/. . . Titan*.

Oed 3

Luctifica (E) or *luctifera* (A)? *Luctificus* is the standard form in STrag, with four uses other than here. Sen. coined *luctifer* at *Herc* 687 where *luctificus* would not fit metrically.

Oed 10

No firm grounds have yet been discerned for choosing between E's *verberat*, which takes *fluctus* as singular, and A's *verberant*, which takes it as plural. Zw. at *Rez*. 218 argues against A that the notion of multiple waves (*fluctus* plural) does not cohere with the picture of a calm sea (*quieti maris*). On the other side one might argue that the theme of constant exposure to attack (n.b. *semper* 8) favours the plural rather than the singular. But since *fluctus*, if singular, would have a

collective sense = 'waves,' it is doubtful whether either argument holds much water.[1]

***Oed* 45**

For detailed discussion and references see Töchterle ad loc., who prefers the E reading *die* (which takes *nubilo* as an adjective) to A's *novo* (which takes it as a noun). *Die* yields a satisfactory sequence, viz. moonlight (44)—sunlight (45)—light of other heavenly bodies (46). Otherwise we would oddly be informed only about the obscuring of heavenly light at *night* (44 and 46). If *die* is correct, A's *novo* will be an interpolation motivated by belief that *nubilo* must be a noun. The word is indeed a noun in its four other appearances in STrag, but its adjectival use is parallelled in Sen.'s prose and in earlier verse.

***Oed* 66**

Like *tumuli discreti* and *tegunt*, the word *sancta* points to what should be the case, but is not so currently in Thebes. The dead should be sacrosanct from harm, and should be revered by surviving relatives (see *OLD* s.v. *sanctus* 1 and 3c respectively), but that is not now the case.[2] The desire of Heinsius, Bentley and Zw. to change the text shows that they read *sancta* as straight description, not as indicating the gap between what should be and what is. This is confirmed by Zw.'s objection that the adjective is out of place in a context of widescale death ("im Zussamenhang des Massensterbens," 1978 152).

***Oed* 69**

The transmitted plural (*levant*), following a second subject which is singular, is parallelled at *Pha* 100f. *non me quies nocturna, non altus sopor/ solvere curis*.[3] A's omission of the line may have been caused by the homoeoteleuton *negant, levant*, which argues for the plural form.

[1] As Zw. notes, Siegmund adduced in favour of A's plural a passage of similar content, *Vit. Beat.* 27.3 *rupes aliqua mari destituta, quam fluctus non desinunt, undecumque moti sunt, verberare*. But of course the option of using a collective singular is more open in poetry than in prose.

[2] Similarly *sancta* at *Pha* 1187 ("*as if* blameless") points to the gap between proper standards and reality.

[3] Zw. follows Bentley in reading *levat* and comparing *Oed* 90 *rueret*—which is no parallel since it has only one subject *vis* (*stricta* in 89 stands for *stricta essent*). The only example in STrag known to me of a singular verb in just the circumstances of this line, viz. with a negatived plural subject followed by a singular subject, is

Oed 76–77

Editors make *negatur . . . parata* a question. But *nempe* is a confirmatory particle: the instance of Oedipus being denied death confirms the general point about the gods' cruelty (see below on *Oct* 195). The only probable example in the corpus of *nempe* used in a question is *Pha* 645, which exactly fits *OLD* s.v. *nempe* 3b, a category that is not applicable here.

Oed 97

Editors since Gronovius have preferred E's *conciperet* to A's *concuteret*, but Schröder 2000 69–73 usefully questions what *conciperet minas* might mean. Gronovius interpreted 'uttered threats.' Now *concipio* in the sense 'utter' is restricted to set formulae of language. We would have to understand, then, that the Sphinx utters a threatening *formula*, "If you fail to solve the riddle, I shall eat you." But this is a lot to supply, especially as *minae* in STrag more usually refers to non-verbal menace, aggression etc. than to verbal threats. Furthermore "utter threats" does not fit with the lion simile of 97[a], which ought to be relevant to 97[b] as well as to 96[b]. In fact it looks as if lines 95–97 should be concerned with *behaviour*, whereas sound begins in 98.

Concipio is often used by Sen. of 'conceiving' ideas, thoughts and feelings. Sometimes the reference is not to an initial 'conception' (which would be inapposite here) but rather to the formation or development or thorough establishment of ideas etc., as at *V. Beat.* 20.2, *Cons. Pol.* 11.6, *NQ* 3 *praef.* 9, *Ep.* 99.23, 102.29. Similarly at Ov. *Met.* 10.351f. *at tu, dum corpore non es/passa nefas, animo ne concipe*, the verb refers not to Myrrha's original thought of incest, which is long past, but to proceeding with it. So I would translate here "developed her aggression/menace." For the beast developing aggression cf. Lucan's lion simile 1.205ff. *sicut . . . leo . . . subsedit dubius, totam dum colligit iram;/mox, ubi se saevae stimulavit verbere caudae* e.q.s.

It is tempting to consider A's *concuteret minas*, "whipped up her menace," which would refer both to the physical lashing of the tail and to its effect in arousing anger.[4] But *OLD* s.v *concutio* 5 lists only

---

Oed 258f. *hunc non quieta tecta, non fidi lares,/non hospitalis exulem tellus ferat*. A singular verb is of course more common when each subject is singular, e.g *Tro* 875, 1177, *Med* 413, *Ag* 617, *Thy* 364. At any rate, in method one should not alter a rarity when it is parallelled and conceivably right.

[4] Similarly Vergil uses the phrases *tollentemque minas* and *attollentem iras* of an angry

one place where the verb means to 'arouse' an emotion, and *TLL* knows of none. It is also difficult to trust A when it so clearly alters *exciperem* to *excuterem* at *Oed* 298.

Oed 109

Sluiter, Zw. and Töchterle rightly choose A's *ostendat* over E's *ostendit*, but the correct justification has not yet been given. The force of a present subjunctive in a protasis is usually to characterise a future possibility as remote, e.g. *Herc* 504 (Lycus believes Hercules will not return), *Med* 82, *Pha* 121, 613 *me per altas ire si iubeas nives, Oed* 1029. Such a suggestion of the improbability of *salus* matches Oedipus' general pessimism. E's present indicative is less appropriate, as it would tend to suggest an imminent possibility (my comm. on *Herc* 1284).

Oed 162

In favour of the A reading see *SA* 59–60, following Carlsson 1929 49–52. I now think it likely that *Phlegethon* here means the underworld in general, as at *Pha* 848, *Ag* 753, rather than the specific river.

Oed 174, 179

On the lacunae in these lines and on possible supplements see *SA* 62f.

Oed 202–05

This passage should be added to those discussed by me at 1981 306 with fn., in which "the Chorus, at the end of an ode, refer to some action occurring onstage (usually the entrance of a character) and thereby lead in to the following Act." Of eleven instances of this dramatic technique, nine (including the present passage) appear in the putatively early plays, viz. those of Group 1. Such passages are often marked by questions, as here, cf. e.g. *Pha* 989 *Sed quid citato nuntius portat gradu?* The Chorus similarly answer their own question, in comparable language, at *Pha* 829ff. *sed iste quisnam est . . .?/en ipse Theseus redditus terris adest,* and answer their own implied question at *Ag* 388–91. E's arrangement, which gives 202–04 to Oedipus and

snake (respectively *Georg.* 3.421 and *Aen.* 2.381) with a double reference, both to its 'raising' of its head and to 'heightening' its threatening anger (so Austin on *Aen.* 2.381). Sen. echoes the usage at *Tro* 1095 *tollit minas*; and *Herc* 105 *concutite pectus* could suggest physical as well as mental blows.

205 to the Chorus, is motivated by the assumption that an answer to a question should be provided by a second speaker.

Oed 216

For the play on *noscere* and οἶδα, v. Fitch & McElduff 2002 26, and cf. *Med* 652 *Idmonem, quamvis bene fata nosset.*

Oed 226

Summisi manus means “reached out my hands,” in a gesture of supplication, rather than “raised” them: *OLD* s.v. *submitto* 4b, Schröder 2000 73–77.

Oed 243

The phrase *quaerit peremptum* means “enquires into the killing,” see *OLD* s.v. *quaero* 8. Oedipus’ argument is that kings must make such enquiries, to punish the perpetrator and so ensure their own safety; the gist of line 243 is that no *subject* has a motive for making such enquiries. Line 240 is therefore an implicit criticism of Creon for failing, while regent, to investigate Laius’ death, and 244 is Creon’s self-exculpation. There is a similar sequence of thought at Soph. *OT* 128–31.

The discussion by Friedrich 63–66 show that scholar’s analytical method at its least impressive. He takes *quaerit* to means ‘misses’ (roughly = *desiderat*), an interpretation in which Zw. and Töchterle oddly follow him. This interpretation gives no connection with the issue of security which is on Oedipus’ mind; accordingly it allows Friedrich to conclude that line 243 is either a free-floating sententia of Sen.’s which the author has not integrated into the context, or else an interpolation.

Oed 266

In view of *alludis, fluctu* clearly means ‘waves’ rather than ‘waters.’ *Brevi* surely means that the waves are ‘shallow’ (so *TLL* 2.2180.81), which sorts well with *alludis*: cf. Luc. 9.317f. *brevis unda superne/innatat*, and for *brevis* of shallow water V. *Aen.* 5.221, Sen. *Ag* 572. (Töchterle takes *brevi* to mean short in *extent*,[5] viz. as extending only from the

[5] So at least his parallels suggest, though he translates *brevi* with the vague “schmal.”

north to the south shore of each gulf, but the *length* of the waves does not seem relevant to their "playing against the shore" of the Isthmus.) There is no need for Axelson's conjecture *fluctu . . . levi*, which in any case is not precisely parallelled in the discussion in *KK*.

Oed 274f.

The traditional punctuation is *sed quo nefandum facinus admissum loco est,/memorate: aperto Marte an insidiis iacet?* This involves taking 274 as an indirect question using an indicative (Töchterle), an unnecessarily complicated interpretation. An imperative such as *memorate* does not need be attached to the *first* question of a series, as 221f. shows. I therefore print with Häuptli *sed quo nefandum facinus admissum loco est?/memorate: aperto Marte an insidiis iacet?*

Oed 283–85

Poetic vagueness about geography, combined with the tendency of proper names to suffer corruption, makes it impossible to feel confidence about the original text. All critics agree, however, that the reference to Elis (*elei* E, *elidis* or *elydis* A) in 285 must be corrupt, since it would make the third road lead towards the Peloponnese, as the second road does.

The first road leads to Delphi,[6] and the second to the Isthmus (279–82). Syntax suggests that the phrase *Olenia in arva* (283) belongs with what follows, and modifies *serpens*, i.e. "winding its way towards the fields of Olenos" (so e.g. Madvig 1873 117 and Leo).[7] The Olenos in Aetolia, mentioned by Hom. *Il.* 2.639 and by Ov. *Fasti* 5.251 *Oleniis . . . ab arvis*, is referred to by Sen. at *Tro* 826, and *Olenius* means roughly 'Aetolian' at Stat. *Theb.* 1.402. The river of 284f., then, should be in or en route to Aetolia, and the best conjecture in 285 is *Eveni* (Madvig), which could easily have been corrupted into a reference to the more familiar Elis. The Evenus is known as

[6] On the basis of Soph. *OT* 734 and of actual geography, Töchterle p. 294 interprets the first road as running to Daulis. But Schröder 2000 84–87 rightly points out that we need a road leading to Delphi.

[7] Some modern editors prefer to attach the phrase as a loose pendant to 282, but this is difficult geographically as well as syntactically: Olenos would now be the town of that name in the far west of Achaea, but there is no reason why such an obscure outlying spot should be mentioned as the terminus of the main road to the Peloponnese.

the Aetolian river where Nessus attempted to rape Deianira and was shot by Hercules, e.g. Ov. *Met.* 9.104 *Eveni rapidas . . . undas*. 'Wandering' is a common description of rivers, applied to this one at *HO* 501f. *vagus Evenos*.

In this case, the three roads are described from the viewpoint of someone approaching the crossroads from the east (Thebes), as Laius was doing (277–78). The geography is schematic, envisaging the first road as running north, the second south, the third west. In point of fact Delphi is on the road running west to Aetolia, but Töchterle's sketch-map p. 294 probably implies a higher level of geographical knowledge than we should expect in this context. Töchterle believes that the three roads are described from the reference-point of the crossroads, and that the third road leads *east*, towards Thebes; but this would be odd in a context where Laius has just travelled *west* on that road. He takes *errantes aquas* to allude to Lake Copais, and his conjecture *Olmii* in 285 names a stream which crosses the road near the lake. But all of this would constitute an opaque way of saying "the road back to Thebes." *Olmii* is not close paleographically to the MSS; and since the *i* of *Olmius* is long, the form *Olmii* yields a disagreeable-sounding double long *i*, unparallelled in the corpus.

Oed 287

Tulit of successful commission of a crime is parallelled at *Pha* 164 *scelus aliqua tutum . . . tulit*. There is no need, therefore, of Zw.'s tentative conjecture *intulit* (OCT app. crit.).

Oed 300

The transmitted reading *depressum* means that lines 299–300 bespeak a single sacrificial animal, but later it is clear that there are *two* animals, one of each gender (341–44). The requirement that sacrificial animals be untouched by the plough (300) is more usually specified for females than males, e.g. Hom. *Il.* 10.293, *Od.* 3.383, Ov. *Fasti* 3.375f., 4.335f., Sen. *Ag* 366; for the formulaic differentiation "a male of outstanding appearance, and a female never used for ploughing" cf. V. *Georg.* 4.550f., Sen. *Med* 60ff. *taurus . . . tergore candido, femina . . . intemptata iugo*. Both reasons support Bentley's supposition that 300 should refer to a second, female, animal. Bentley's drastic rewriting *nulloque vaccam colla depressam iugo* was modified into a paleographically more plausible form by Leo, who simply wrote *depressam* for *depressum*. (For use of a participle without an accompanying noun see

above on *Phoen* 320.) *Victima* in 303 is either a collective singular, or else refers to the more prestigious of the two animals.

This solution does not, however, remove an inconsistency with 334 *huc propere admove*, where Tiresias orders the animals to be brought to the altar, something which has already been done in 299–303. *Admovere* is a technical term for leading victims to the altar (Zw. *Rez.* 183 fn.), cf. V. *Aen.* 12.171, Ov. *Met.* 7.593, 13.454, Luc. 1.608, Tac. *Ann.* 2.69 *admotas hostias*; Axelson's attempt (*KK*) to remove the inconsistency by understanding *admove* <*salsam molam*> from 335 is not persuasive. It appears that Sen. has the animals brought in at 299f. to initiate the whole divination scene, and then inadvertently repeats the command at the beginning of the extispicy proper (334). The inconsistency may be added to other indications that this Act was not written for performance.[8]

Oed 377

Clearly there is some fault in the text here. Line 377 merely reverts to the kind of symptoms listed at the beginning of the speech (cf. *cruor* 355, *livent* 357). It does not prepare for the exceptional omens of 378–80; on the contrary, it disrupts the progression from the movements of the unnatural foetus in 375–76 to the even more portentous movements of the adult beasts.

Oed 386

On the form of the sententia see below on *Ag* 934.

Oed 404

I follow recent editors in reading *armatus* (RThE), but with misgivings: it involves two grammatical shifts in three lines, from a masculine vocative (*redimite*) to a masculine nominative (*armatus*) to a neuter vocative (*lucidum . . . decus*). In defence of the first shift, from *redimite* to *armatus*, Zw. invokes J. Svennung, *Anredenformen* (Uppsala 1958) 253ff. and Löfstedt, *Syntactica* 1.92–102. But in the passages from the first centuries B.C. and A.D. discussed by those authorities, there is regularly a good reason in sense and syntax for the distinction between nominative and vocative. E.g. at Prop. 2.6.19f. *tu criminis auctor,/nutritus duro, Romule, lacte lupae*, the nominative *nutritus*

[8] See Fitch 2000 9–11 and Schröder 2000 87–88.

qualifies the predicate *auctor*, i.e. "you were the instigator of the crime, because you were nourished . . ."[9] No instance is cited of a shift from voc. to nom. or vice versa in words which are so precisely parallel in form (perfect participle passive) and construction (accusative of part of the body, plus ablative of means) as here.

The possibility that Sen. wrote *armate* (voc.) to match *redimite* is probably ruled out by metre, unless we assume that Sen. is making a bold metrical experiment at the beginning of this highly experimental ode.[10] The other possibility, then, is to take *redimite* as an imperative, addressed to members of the Chorus. The flowing hair and soft hands of 403f., now pertaining to the Chorus, will indicate that they are female: hence one will now read *armatae.*[11] In view of the appeal of Bacchic cults to women, it would not be surprising to find a female Chorus singing Bacchus' praises, as in Eur. *Ba.* But there is no other indication of female gender, nor does Tiresias' phrase *populare carmen* particularly support it.

Oed 425

Axelson followed by Zw. writes *veste cum longa regere et leones* for the transmitted *veste cum longa regeres leones*, perhaps to exclude any possibility that *veste . . . longa* might be read wrongly as an ablative of means, by turning *cum* into a preposition instead of a conjunction. But postponement of *et* is unusual, even in the choral odes (six examples in lyric in STrag, see above on *Herc* 233), and the line already contains one postponed word (*cum*).

---

[9] Similarly at Ov. *Her.* 14.73 *surge age, Belide, de tot modo fratribus unus* the nominative conveys, "you who alone are left."

[10] It would require an open final syllable (*-te*) in thesis, i.e. in the second half of the dactylic foot, to be closed (lengthened) before a mute + liquid combination. Such closure in thesis apparently occurs in the fourth foot only twice in Homeric hexameters, and only with monosyllables (*Il.* 24.557, *Od.* 17.573), though it occurs "several times" in the second foot (West, *Greek Metre* 39 fn. 23). In Vergilian hexameters, closure of an open final syllable before mute + liquid occurs only in arsis (first half of the foot), and only with *-que* (Williams on V. *Aen.* 3.91 and 464; see also Fordyce on Cat. 4.9). In the Senecan corpus the only certain examples of closure of an open final syllable occur before *sc-* (*Pha* 1026) and *sp-* (*Herc* 950: see my comm. ad loc.).

[11] Attribution of these conjectures is difficult. The reading *armate* attributed by editors to recc. could be variously intended as a vocative, an imperative, or a spelling of *armatae*. Gronovius reports that most editions and MSS read *armatae* but also transpose 404 and 405, so that *armatae* presumably agrees with *Thebae*.

Oed 439–40

On the transposition of these lines after 435, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 302f.

Oed 468

On *ripa* = 'stream' see above on *Med* 742. For disjunctiveness and other kinds of pleonasm in descriptions of waters, see my comm. on *Herc* 683 and 536.

Oed 502

Conclusive support for the transmitted *odit* is given by Ov. *Met.* 2.615f., where a regretful god similarly 'hates' his weapons, which have killed his human lover: *nec non arcumque manumque/odit cumque manu temeraria tela, sagittas*. (That passage also influences *Herc* 1229–36, as I should have noted in my comm.) Further arguments in favour of *odit* are given by Töchterle ad loc.

Oed 532–37

Cupressus and *quercus* are often understood to mean single trees, with *huius* referring to the latter and *illa* to the former. But this will not work: the vigorous cypress of 532–33 cannot be identical with the collapsing tree of 536–37; in view of the slender shape of the cypress, 533 cannot describe a single tree; and even if 532–33 could refer to a single dominant cypress, this would not be compatible with the overarching tree of 542–44. Rather *cupressus* and *quercus* are collective singulars (so already Nevyle 1563), like *laurus, myrtus, alnus* and *pinus* below; *huius* and *illa* refer to two oaks. For another confusing collective use of a tree-name see above on *Pha* 1223.

Oed 538–41

Because this catalogue has no verb, Reeve postulates a lacuna before 538 or after 541 (OCT app. crit.). The traditional solution is to understand *sunt*, 'there are,' with the whole catalogue. Leo noted that ellipse of *esse* is unusually frequent in *Oed* in the perfect passive (1.192), and this frequency extends to other uses of *esse* also (Töchterle on 141f.). Instances where the omitted form could be translated 'there is/are' include 151, 183, 372, 398, 922.

Oed 548–50

Tum in 550 should indicate that a previous stage of the ritual has occurred. But this previous stage cannot be constituted by 548–49, which is solely preparatory. Zw. 1979 185f. may therefore be right in postulating a lacuna, perhaps containing the setting-up of an altar as at Ov. *Met.* 7.240 and Stat. *Theb.* 4.455–57, or the wreathing of the sacrificial animals as at Stat. *Theb.* 4.445–47. The hiatus of sense may, however, evince a degree of incompleteness in this section of the narrative (cf. note on 551–55).

Oed 551–55

Weber's transposition of 553 after 554 is justified, as Zw. 1979 186 shows, but there remains an inconsonance between 551f. *ipse funesto integit/vates amictu corpus* and 554 *squalente cultu maestus ingreditur senex*. It is not an issue of tautology, since *squalente cultu* denotes not dress but a state of dishevelment and dirtiness (so Gronovius); this state is like a mourner's, a suggestion strengthened by *maestus*. But the form of 554 suggests the *beginning* of a description of Tiresias' appearance, rather than a continuation of that begun at 551. Again this may be a sign of lack of revision on Sen.'s part.

Oed 560

There is no need of Heinsius' conjecture *Lethaei* for the transmitted *letalis*. *Letalis* can mean 'of death' (*OLD* s.v. 1), and Töchterle cites the conclusive parallel for its use of underworld localities, Sil. 6.154 *letalem ripam et lucos habitabat Avernos*. Furthermore, when *lacus* is used of underworld waters in STrag, its adjectives are more often based on characteristics (*iuratos superis Tro* 391, *invii Pha* 93, *torpentes Pha* 1201, *tristes Ag* 12) than on proper names (only *Tartareos Pha* 1179, *Stygios Ag* 750).

Oed 619–23

The punctuation introduced by Leo, and seen in the OCT, places everything from *instat* 621 to *opertos* 623 in parentheses, thus severing *Laius* 623 from its context and forcing it to become the subject of 619–21[a]. Such a tortured construction would be unthinkable in an ancient text largely devoid of punctuation and designed to be heard. Leo's purpose was to provide an explicit subject for the clauses of 619–21[a], which otherwise have none. (For his similarly motivated,

and similarly awkward, punctuation of *Herc* 722 see my comm. ad loc.) But the introduction of Laius without a name is parallelled at 393. Subject change without explicit identification of the new subject is not, in fact, uncommon in STrag: in *Herc* alone v. 33, 275, 312, 807f. In *Herc* the omissions indicate that Hercules is so well known in the speakers' minds as to need no identification (my comm. on *Herc* 33ff., cf. Costa on *Med* 415); here in *Oed* the initial omission heightens the sense of foreboding, and the withholding of Laius' identity matches his physical self-concealment.

Oed 636–37

Meaning and syntax are so awkward as to justify Zw.'s excision of these lines (1976 196f.). The phrase *utero gravis* suggests that *parens* means 'mother' (so e.g. Gronovius, Miller), and indeed the couplet looks like a misogynistic demonizing of Jocasta. Such an attack on Jocasta is completely out of place in this speech, which concentrates fiercely on the 'crimes' of Oedipus. Recent critics have therefore interpreted, "detested offspring—yet worse as a father than as a son, burdening that ill-fated womb a second time." (He "burdened" it first as a foetus himself, and second by impregnating Jocasta.) But this is unsatisfactory in various ways: in particular *natus* picks up *proles*, yet *proles* is used in relation to the father (*patris* immediately precedes), whereas *natus* is used in relation to the mother.

Syntax is no better. Zw. follows Axelson in supposing that 636–37 are in apposition to the relative clause in 634–35, and that the relative clause resumes in 638 *egitque* e.q.s. This makes for an awkward construction, particularly since the central point of the apposition, viz. the incest, is then repeated immediately, but in a different syntactical construction, in 638ff. The alternative is to place a period after either *patris* or *proles*, and to read *sed tamen* e.q.s. as a main clause, with which *egitque* e.q.s. is coordinate: "yet [he is] worse as a father than as a son, burdening that ill-fated womb a second time, and he pushed to his very source . . ."[12] Again there is evident awk-

[12] Töchterle, who defends the lines, accepts Axelson's view of the syntax in his comm. In his text, however, he places a period after *patris*, and translates: "Verhaßter Sproß: aber doch als Vater noch schlechter denn als Sohn, den unseligen Leib erneut beschwerend, drängte er sich selbst zu seinem Ursprung . . ." This makes the syntax look less difficult than it is, by omitting the *-que* of *egitque*.

wardness here, lying partly in the fact that the active verb *egit* is coordinated with a copulative verb *est* which is in ellipse.

***Oed* 649**

Leo 1.223f., followed by Zw., accepts recc. *relinquat* for the transmitted *relinquet*. He explains this *relinquat* as a hypothetical subjunctive equivalent to a condition, for which he compares *Med* 238 *virgini placeat pudor/paterque placeat: tota cum ducibus ruet/Pelasga tellus*, *Pha* 478 etc. (add *Pha* 469). But that construction is used for highly improbable suppositions, whereas *relinquat* after *agite* would inevitably be a genuinely jussive subjunctive. Furthermore none of the passages cited by Leo parallels the awkward shift of *solum* from object of *relinquat* to subject of *reparabit* (so Sluiter). I follow the majority of editors in reading *quodcumque* (KQ) . . . *solum relinquet*. For the unusual sense-pause at the end of the second foot (*agite exulem*) cf. 663.

***Oed* 667**

I take the line to mean, "Is the old man [Tiresias] playing false, or is the god [Apollo] ill-disposed to Thebes?" Apollo's oracular command to find the murderer of Laius, as furthered by the necromancy instigated by Tiresias, has resulted in Oedipus being accused not only of Laius' murder, but also of parricide and incest. To Oedipus these charges appear groundless (961–66), and he therefore surmises that either Tiresias is practicing chicanery, or else Apollo's response was malicious, designed to withhold any solution of the plague at Thebes.[13]

The second half of the line has been taken to mean, "is *some* god afflicting Thebes?" (so e.g. Töchterle). Oedipus might have offered such an explanation for the plague afflicting Thebes, but scarcely for the specific charges against himself, which are his immediate concern.[14] Furthermore *deus* here does not easily suggest *aliquis deus*, but

[13] Friedrich 75–81, following his usual analytical method, argued that *falsusne senior* fits the situation in Soph. *OT*, where Tiresias has himself accused Oedipus, but not that in Sen.'s play, where Tiresias has made no such accusation. This hypothesis requires us to interpret *falsus* specifically as 'lying' ("lügt hier der greise Seher," Friedrich 76) rather than 'deceptive,' but these senses are scarcely distinct enough to support the hypothesis. See further Töchterle on 659–708.

[14] Miller translates, "is some god oppressing Thebes?" and glosses "i.e. bringing sedition as well as pestilence" (so Farnaby). But since sedition has not yet been mentioned, this explanation would be difficult for the audience to grasp. In any

more naturally means *the* god in question (viz. Apollo), like *deus* at 217 and ὁ θεός at Soph. *OT* 77, 86, 95, 253.

Oed 702

Leo's conjecture *cadat* showed how the corruption should be cured, but Enk's *ruat* (apud Sluiter) is superior both rhetorically and paleographically. The hyperbole conveyed by both the meaning and gender of *omne* demands a more vigorous verb than *cadere*. For *ruere* conjoined with *omnis* or *totus* cf. *Phoen* 443f. *omnis ruat/una iuventus*, *Pha* 674 *omnis impulsus ruat/aether, Herc* 1167 *ruat ira in omnes* (all passages evincing strong emotion, as here), also *Oed* 53 *sed omnis aetas pariter et sexus ruit*, *Med* 239f. *tota cum ducibus ruet/Pelasga tellus*, *Herc* 1046 *totus ad terram ruit*.

Oed 712ff.

The Chorus have declared that the cause of Thebes' sufferings is not Oedipus, but the ancient anger of the gods. They now recall the familar myth of Cadmus following a straying cow from Delphi, and accepting the spot where she sank down to rest as the site for his new city (cf. particularly Ov. *Met.* 3.6–25). The clear implication is that Thebes' troubles originated in this process (not, e.g., in the subsequent slaying of the serpent of Mars). In particular the main clauses of 712–14, juxtaposed with the Chorus' opening statement, should have some special relevance to it.

Since they did not perceive such relevance, Leo 1.114 fn. and Stuart 1911 37f. conjectured *Castalium <ut> nemus*. This reduces the whole of 712^{b}–723 to a purely chronological preface to 724ff., a long-winded way of saying "ever since the city's foundation;" 712–14 become temporal clauses coordinate with 715–23 (with *ut* in the sense 'ever since,' *OLD* s.v. 27) and subordinate to 724–25.

But the special focus of lines 712–14 is on the proper names *Castalium—Sidonio* and *Dirce—Tyrios*, and therein perhaps lies their relevance. I suggest that these names represent the arrival of Cadmus and his followers as one of the fatal contacts between East and West, Asia and Europe. A similar contact was the arrival of the "Phrygian guest" (n.b. *hospes* again) at Greek Amyclae, "ever since" which the

case, Oedipus would hardly suggest divine anger as the cause of the supposed plot against him, for which he would suspect all too human motives.

Trojan women have mourned: *hoc continuis egimus annis,/ex quo tetigit/Phrygius Graias hospes Amyclas* (*Tro* 69–71). Another was the arrival of the *Argo* in Colchis, and subsequently of Medea in Greece, conveyed with proper names in Eur. *Med* 1–10 (and more discursively in the choral odes of Sen. *Med*). Though the action of 714 sounds benign, use of a river normally identifies those who are native to the place (e.g. *Tro* 9ff., *Phoen* 127, *Pha* 58f., *Oed* 427f., *Ag* 316ff.) and therefore connotes settled order; so use of a *foreign* river can be regarded as an *adynaton* (V. *Ecl.* 1.61f. *ante perreratis amborum finibus exul/aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim*), and its occurrence can therefore connote disorder.

It looks as if there is a special thematic relevance also in the last line of the section, *inauspicata de bove tradidit* (723), as there is in the last line of the ode, *nimium saevi diva pudoris* (763). Could it be that the inauspicious feature of the cow lay in the white moon-like markings on each flank, mentioned by Paus. 9.12.1, Hyg. *Fab.* 178, schol. Eur. *Phoen* 638? Since no extant source describes this or any other feature of the cow as ill-omened, Seneca *doctus* may here be alluding to an obscure minor mythical tradition, as he does elsewhere (Mayer 1990 397–402). Or the point may be that a cow *ipso facto* does not provide the sort of auspices one would wish for in the selector of a townsite and the eponymous hero of a people.

The episode of foreigners finding the site of future Thebes, then, is presented as an ἀρχὴ κακῶν, with which the subsequent *monstra* of 726ff. are in accord.[15] Admittedly the theme of the gods' anger is not clearly developed (except in the case of Actaeon), but the main point is that the plague is one in a series of disasters, which in a mythical context can scarcely be explained otherwise than by divine anger.

Oed 727

The transmitted *supra* can be defended, particularly if one reads *supra* (A) in 727• too, resulting (with 728) in a threefold repetition of the

[15] One might have expected the slaying of Mars' serpent to be presented as the *fons et origo* of Thebes' troubles; but Mars' anger at the slaying was directed specifically against Cadmus, rather than the city (for this distinction cf. Ov. *Met.* 4.565–66). It is noteworthy that in the account of the serpent at 726–30 there is no mention of its slaying, and its appearance is presented as one of a series of *monstra* afflicting Thebes, viz. as a manifestation, not a cause. The origin of Thebes' troubles should therefore lie in 712–23.

preposition (so Hudson-Williams 1991 431f.). It seems probable, however, that *robora* and *Chaonias arbores* are not synonymous in the sense of 'oaks,' in view of their separation by pines, and that *robora* refers rather to the stout trunks of trees in general, as at 575. In that case Reeve's *circa* is clearly preferable. As *KK* points out, *circa* need not necessarily mean that the serpent *coils* around the *robora*, as serpents do at Luc. 3.421, 9.364.

In 727• A's *supra* is preferable to E's *superat*, since the anaphora it creates with *supra* in 728 has an enumerative effect and creates a parallel between the two species of trees. *Supra* is also a more probable trigger than *superat* for the corruption of *circa* to *supra* in 727.

Oed 762

Editors vary between E's *ibi* and A's *ubi*. As much the rarer word, with only one other use in the corpus, *ibi* is more likely to have been displaced. There is an understandable tendency for choral odes to end with short sentences, to point a significant detail or a moral. The only endings of odes which do not contain a main verb in the last three lines are *Med* 375ff. and *Ag* 103ff. The use of a deictic (*ibi*) to point a significant mythical detail at the end of an ode is parallelled at *Thy* 174f. *hic bibit/altum de rapido gurgite pulverem*.

Oed 817–18

Delrius indicated how to interpret *prima languescit senum memoria*, by his citation of the elder Seneca, *Contr.* 1 *praef.* 2 *memoria, ex omnibus partibus animi maxime delicata et fragilis, in quam senectus primam incurrit* (viz. [the part of the mind] "that old age attacks first"). So here, "Old men's memory is the first [of their faculties] to weaken." Miller translates, "An old man's early memory grows dim," and similarly Töchterle; but the episode in question would hardly be Phorbas' *first* memory (*prima*), since he had already become chief herdsman at the time.

Oed 832

E's text *nihil lacessas, ipsa se fata explicent* is stylish and makes perfect sense in the context: "stir nothing up, let fate unfold itself." Of course Jocasta hopes that, if Oedipus stops meddling, fate will *not* do so; the subjunctive *explicent* therefore has, for her, a dismissive tone comparable to that more overt in *eat* at *Herc* 196–98 *alius curru sublimis eat:/me mea tellus/lare secreto tutoque tegat*.

A has *ut nihil accersas* (*arcessas* CS), *ipsa te fata explicant*. Clearly *accersas* arose through loss of initial *l* by haplography, and the A interpolator then attempted to improve style and sense by inserting *ut*, replacing *se* with *te* and altering *explicent* to *explicant*, to give, "Though you invite them not at all, the fates are revealing you." Some editors mix and match the two traditions, printing the amalgam *ut nil lacessas, ipsa se fata explicant*, "though you stir up nothing, fate reveals/ is revealing itself." This is a dubious procedure: it postulates corruption in both MSS traditions, an unnecessarily complicated hypothesis. Nor is the sense persuasive in the context: while *explicant* for Oedipus would be gnomic, 'reveal,' it would reflect Jocasta's own knowledge that fate 'is revealing' itself, and she is surely more likely to wish this fact away than to acknowledge it. Zw. argues that A's concessive *ut* is redolent of Sen.'s style, citing four instances in the tragedies; but of course the usage is familiar in literary Latin, with many instances in Cicero and five in Ov. *Pont.* 1 alone (3.13, 83, 93; 7.19, 25). An equally stylish (not concessive) *ut* is inserted by A at *Phoen* 575, and a more standard one at *HO* 169.

Oed 908

On the one side we have Zw.'s forceful advocacy of deletion of the line, first proposed by Goebel; on the other, Bücheler's brilliant conjecture *compede* for the unmetrical *comes*. Zw. shows that, with 908 absent, *implicitas* would mean that Icarus' hands are 'impeded, hampered' by the waters of the sea, cf. Curt. 8.13.16, V. Fl. 2.26, Stat. *Theb*. 4.814. If 906–07 are the last lines of the episode, then, why does Sen. use such a conclusion? Part of Zw.'s answer is that the sea forms a polar opposite to the stars which were Icarus' goal (*KK* p. 255 foot). But in Sen. there is not the same focus on the complementary extremes of sky and sea as we find in Ov. *Ars* 2.59–62 *Nam sive aetherias vicino sole per auras/ibimus, impatiens cera caloris erit;/ sive humiles propiore freto iactabimus alas,/mobilis aequoreis pinna madescet aquis*. Sen.'s version, and the moral commentary which frames it, is focussed more on the contrast between maintaining a "middle way" (*medium iter* 899f., cf. *media via* 890f.), as Daedalus does, and abandoning it (*excessit modum* 909) with disastrous consequences, as Icarus does.

The more precise question is why Sen. ends the episode with the image of Icarus *swimming* in the sea, rather than saying that he plunged into the sea or drowned there, as e.g. Ovid does at *Ars* 2.91f. *decidit, atque cadens "pater, o pater, auferor!" inquit;/clauserunt virides*

ora loquentis aquae. Zw.'s answer is that the movement of the arms in the sea contrasts with their previous movement in the air: "Noch in den Fluten regt er die 'vom Meer umschlungenen' (~ins Meer versunkenen) Arme, mit denen er zuvor in der Luft die echten Vögel zu übertreffen gesucht hatte (895f.)." But again the writing of the passage does not quite support that contrast: Sen. does not mention the movement of the arms in flight, whereas Ovid mentions it for both Daedalus and Icarus (*Ars* 2.73, 86, 89).

A more satisfying answer is provided by retention of 908 with Bücheler's correction *compede audacis viae*. As he tries to swim, Icarus' arms are fatally entangled by the very fastenings that made his overconfident flight possible. The phrase *audacis viae* underlines this point, and at the same time provides a strong close for the narrative, contrasting with *media via* and *medium iter*. The phrase *compede audacis viae* has the authentic ring of Senecan diction in two respects. First, Sen. likes to join a physical term (*compede*) with an abstract or conceptual term (*audacis viae*), v. Fantham's *Troades* p. 34 and Tarrant's *Thyestes* pp. 26–27. Second, he also likes to explore the ambiguity of 'fastening:' at *Thy* 544 *vincla* connotes both a diadem and a bond which makes Thyestes prisoner (Tarrant ad loc., cf. *Tro* 273, *Phoen* 471). So here the fastenings which allowed Icarus to make his *audax via* are also bonds which impede his swimming. Ovid designates the wings' fastenings as *vincula* (*Ars* 2.46), which may have suggested such a play to Sen. here.

***Oed* 942**

I follow Gronovius and Zw. *Rez.* 194 in accepting Grotius' palmary emendation *solvendo non es*, "you cannot pay [your mother, children and country]." The decisive parallel is Sen. *Contr.* 10.4.22 *ut solvendo sis in poenas, quoties tibi renascendum est?* (cf. *renasci* here at 946). For *solvendo esse* in the negative *KK* compares Sen. *Ep.* 118.1 *solvendo non eris*. Töchterle followed by Fantham 1998 677 defends the paradosis *solvenda non est illa quae leges suas/Natura in uno vertit Oedipoda* along the lines adumbrated by Schröder: Nature, which has already brought about Oedipus' *un*natural birth, must not be 'annulled,' i.e. prevented from bringing about future unnatural births in his case. But this sense is difficult to extract, first because there has been no suggestion that Nature might be 'annulled' in this way, and second because the phrase *leges ratas . . . vertit* works against it, by suggesting that Oedipus' birth itself 'annuls' Nature's laws (cf. 25, 371).

Oed 952[b]–53

It remains uncertain whether the words from *subitus en* to *genas* are self-description by Oedipus or narration by the messenger. I choose the first possibility, chiefly to avoid what might be seen as an interruption of Oedipus' speech near its climax. Töchterle compares other leading figures' observation of their own tears, *Med* 937, *Thy* 950, 967. But the second possibility is entirely conceivable. In that case the messenger inserts a brief description of Oedipus' action, and then quotes Oedipus' own comment on that action, exactly as in 935–36, and again without an introduction of the quotation such as *ait*. For *en* used in a messenger-speech to mark a new development which the messenger witnessed cf. *Pha* 1025, and similarly *ecce* at *Ag* 528.

Oed 961

EA have *tantum eruentis*, but this *tantum* cannot be construed, and Sluiter's correction to *iamiam* is persuasive. The genitive *eruentis* is possessive but also has overtones of a genitive of characteristic, i.e. "his gaze was . . . angry and fierce, *as might be expected* of one about to root it out."

Töchterle offers but does not adopt *eruendus* for *eruentis*, which worth considering, and for which he cites *Prov.* 5.2 *detestabilis erit caecitas, si nemo oculos perdiderit nisi cui eruendi sunt*. Why is is that Oedipus' gaze "must be rooted out"? Presumably either because Oedipus has decided so, or because it has the evil characteristics listed in 960 *violentus audax vultus, iratus ferox*. I am not fully convinced by either sense. Töchterle claims that *eruendus* fits the 'active' portrayal of Oedipus' eyes in 959–64; but this seems to envisage a meaning "*demanding* to be rooted out," which is stronger than the gerundive can carry.

Oed 987

The transmitted *secto* is defended by Töchterle ad loc. For phrases such as *viam secare* see the passages collected in *OLD* s.v. *seco* 6. *Sectus* has just the sense required here, of a path already 'cut' and so fixed, at Lucr. 5.272, V. *Georg.* 1.238, Ov. *Met.* 2.130 (*pace* Fantham 1998 677).

Oed 1012

CSP have *quis frui et tenebris vetat*, "who prevents me from enjoying *even* my darkness?" This is more pointed than ET *quis frui tenebris vetat*. Probably, then, *et* has been omitted by ET separately, as by

EP separately at *Herc* 1280. For elision of *et* in this position cf. e.g. 1016, 1039, 1052; for *et* = *etiam* cf. 235, 261, 268, 516, 654.[16]

Oed **1032–34**

The best reading of these lines, with *parricida* amplified by *restat hoc operi ultimum* and self-address recommencing with *rapiatur ensis*, is found e.g. in Neville's translation of 1560 (published 1563), in the *editio Lemairiana* (1829–31) and in Miller's Loeb (1917).

Oed **1051**

In his comment on the phrase *ne in matrem incidas*, Töchterle accepts a suggestion of renewed incest, but says there is no evidence elsewhere of *incidere* used in a specifically sexual sense. One should, however, compare Cic. *Cael.* 69 *nihil est quod in mulierem eiusmodi non cadere videatur* and Sen. *Contr.* 1.5.2 (the rapist of two girls) *dum te peto, in illam incidi.* In both places there is a suggestion of a sexual meaning in the verb, as is the case here too.

Oed **1052–53**

On the conjecture *pectore* for EA *corpore* in 1052, and the correctness of A's *corpora* in 1053, see *Phoenix* 56 (2002) 312f.

[16] The *Index Verborum* by Oldfather, Pease and Canter makes *et* = *etiam* a separate entry from the copula *et*, but places several instances of *et* in the wrong entry.

Ag 5

The use of *en* with a "mental event" is questioned by Tarrant ad loc., but <u>*horret*</u> *animus* is physical as well as mental, particularly when linked with *pavor membra excutit.* There are comparable uses of *ecce* with psychosomatic reactions at *Herc* 1298f. *ecce quam miserum metu/cor palpitat pectusque sollicitum ferit* and *Med* 991f. *voluptas magna me invitam subit,/et ecce crescit* (the latter in self-address, as here).

Ag 33

In this context of ambiguous language (32 with Tarrant ad loc.) and ambiguous relationships (35–36) it seems over-precise to insist with Tarrant and Zw. that *uterum gravem/me patre dignum* must refer only to the *content* of the womb. Rather *uterum gravem* is understood first of the womb itself, and *me patre* points to Thyestes as father of Pelopia and so of her womb. The context then enforces a second meaning, viz. that Thyestes was also father of the content of her womb.[1] This double reference of *patre* is in keeping with the doubling of relationships detailed in 35–36. The gist of *me patre dignum* is "as sinful as me." (There may also be a further sense that Pelopia was filled unnaturally with her own stock, as was Thyestes, *liberis plenus tribus* 26.)

Ag 52

Matrem here connotes not only "a mother who conceived incestuously," but also "a mother who conceived incestuously so that you might avenge the family." In this sense *matrem* takes up and reinforces *causa natalis tui,/Aegisthe, venit* (48f.). The imminent crime of murdering Agamemnon therefore 'befits' Aegisthus (*decet*) as one conceived both criminally and to commit this specific crime. I see no need for Zw's conjecture *patrem*, which would remove the specific reference to Aegisthus' conception, and substitute a vaguer parallel between Aegisthus and Thyestes.

---

[1] Similarly Williams 1981 80: "*uterum gravem* allows two things to be said at once: the act of fatherhood upon his daughter as well as its product is worthy of Thyestes."

_Ag_ 57

Is *magnis bonis* dative or instrumental ablative? I incline to the latter alternative for two reasons. First, Fortune does not deceive the wealth and power of kings, but rather deceives humans who are taken in *by* such things, regarding them as secure or as true *bona*. Second, *magnis bonis* must be ironic here, and the irony is more evident if the idea of 'blessings' is closely linked with that of deception. (There is then no need to consider Axelson's *vanis* for *magnis*.) For *fallax* with an ablative cf. Pliny *NQ* 25.8 *pictura fallax est coloribus tam numerosis*, Tac. *Ann.* 16.32 *specie . . . amicitiae fallaces* (the first causal rather than instrumental, but with much the same effect).

_Ag_ 59

Should one correct to *excelsa nimis* with Bentley or *nimis excelsos* with Withof? In addition to the arguments in *KK*, metre strongly supports *excelsa nimis*. In monometers of this kind (viz. those ending a 3-metron unit of sense), SA (spondee-anapaest) is much more common than AS; furthermore AS never follows a dimeter ending AA (*SA* p. 32, Table Xa).

_Ag_ 121

Mycenaeas domos is virtually a synonym for *Mycenas*, cf. *Thy* 123 *Pisaeasque domos*. It was perhaps unfamiliarity with this usage that led to corruption here.

_Ag_ 137

Devictus (PT) is clearly superior here to *devinctus* (ECS), as Tarrant shows. Since *devictus* fits the context well, I see no need to consider *deiectus*, a MS variant found by Ascensius and perhaps lifted from *Tro* 449 *sed fessus ac deiectus*.

_Ag_ 162

Tarrant ad loc. scrupulously weighs the variants *doletque* (E) and *pigetque* (A), accepting the latter "after some vacillation." The impersonal use of *dolet* is relatively rare, and associated with tragic diction as Tarrant's citations from republican drama show: those facts tip the balance in favour of *dolet* in my view.

Ag 163

The idea is adapted from Ov. *Met.* 13.516 *inferias hosti peperi!* (Hecuba referring to the sacrificed Polyxena). This strengthens the already strong case for E's *peperi* against A's *peperit*.

Ag 195–99

Axelson and Zw. delete 198[b]–99[a], on the grounds that Clytemnestra's plan to kill Agamemnon is actually motivated by self-interest, not by the future well-being of her children, whom in fact she treats as enemies in Act 5. Consequently they take *horum* (196[b]) to refer not to the children (as generally interpreted) but to Clytemnestra and Aegisthus. Once again these critics are mistakenly expecting accuracy and consistency from a Senecan passion-figure, where one should expect tendentiousness and self-dramatisation according to the emotion of the moment. Here Clytemnestra dramatises herself as defender of her children:[2] only so does it make sense for her to imagine sacrificing her own life to kill Agamemnon (199–202). If *horum* meant Clytemnestra and Aegisthus, the notion of self-sacrifice would make no sense.

The text as traditionally understood gives a satisfactory contrast between *morantur* and *moveant*: rather than hindering you, the thought of the children should spur you on. The phrase *mala ventura* suggests that lines 195–96[a] by contrast are not concerned with the future, viz. the fact that the children will be fatherless (Tarrant), but with the present, viz. the restraining presence of the children in the house as mute reminders of *pudor* and *pietas*. For the association of *virgo* and *pudor* cf. 954–57. Orestes' resemblance to his father (196 *patrique Orestes similis*) is itself a reminder of the claims of *pudor*, cf. Cat. 61. 214–18 *sit suo similis patri/ . . . et pudicitiam suae/matris indicet ore*; the phrase also suggests that Clytemnestra's love for Orestes deters her from killing the man he resembles.

Ag 210

The transmitted text *non melior Aiax morte decreta furens* must mean "nor the better Ajax, raging after his decision to die."[3] But "raging

---

[2] G. Mader in *Act. Class.* 31 (1988) 69 fn. 48 argues on similar grounds for retention of 198[b]–99[a]; cf. p. 61, "the outburst of maternal concern is a specious pretext for the planned crime . . . the crime is 'justified' by what the reader recognizes as a patent misrepresentation of reality."

[3] To take *melior* with *morte decreta*, "better after deciding on death" ("better" in

after his decision to die" is not consistent with the canonical Sophoclean account, in which Ajax' decision to die came only after he recovered his sanity, and realised that in madness he had attacked animals instead of the Greek leaders. Perhaps Sen. knew a different account, e.g. one in which Ajax decided in rage on murder-suicide; or perhaps Sen. merges the successive states of the canonical version into a single picture of Ajax as furiously belligerent against the Greek leadership and himself. (Ovid has Ajax commit suicide in a state of *ira* and *dolor, Met.* 13.385f.: Sen.'s *furens* may make no distinction between anger and insanity.) Alternatively Sen. may have written *caede decreta furens*, "raging after deciding on murder" (viz. of the Greek leaders); this would parallel the phrase in 209 indicating Achilles' preparedness to kill Agamemnon. In this case someone misunderstood *caede* to refer to suicide, and replaced it with *morte*.

Melior distinguishes Telamonian Ajax from the Locrian. Pairs of people etc. tend to generate comparisons (Ov. *Met.* 12. 623 *non minor Atrides, non bello maior et aevo*), and such comparisons are particularly pointed in Sen.'s pointed style, e.g. *Herc* 72 *meliusque collo sedit Herculeo polus* (better than on Atlas' neck), 906 *soror sagittis aptior, Phoebus lyrae, Med* 88f. *cedet Castore cum suo/Pollux caestibus aptior, Tro* 816ff. *an viros tellus dare militares/aptior Pthie meliorque fetu/fortis armenti lapidosa Trachin.* The Telamonian is the 'better Ajax' for similar reasons to those that make him the 'true Ajax' at *Tro* 844 (see ad loc.).

Ag 264

In the text as transmitted, *lex alia solio est, alia privato in toro*, the shift from dative to *in* + ablative gives *variatio* and should therefore not be removed by deletion of *in*. Compare the shift from ablative to *in* + ablative at *Med* 323–25 *nunc antemnas/medio tutas ponere malo,/nunc in summo religare loco.*

Ag 273–76

There are two difficulties in the text. First, *Atriden* is naturally taken to refer to Agamemnon, the subject of the previous discussion; only the content of 276 makes it clear that *Atriden* refers to Menelaus.

---

the sense of "more admirable," as in Sophocles' play) does violence to the line's phrasing. This interpretation, proposed by Tarrant, was taken up by Zw. in *KK* but jettisoned by him a year later, 1987 89.

Second, Clytemnestra speaks of Agamemnon forgiving Helen (*ignovit Helenae* 273), but Aegisthus replies as if the issue were *Menelaus'* forgiving of her.

Damsté 1919 111 solved both problems simultaneously by writing *hunc nulla* for *sed nulla*. Clytemnestra has indicated by the phrase *iuncta Menelao* that Menelaus as well as his brother forgave Helen. With *hunc Atriden* Aegisthus makes a distinction between the two brothers, thus identifying the obvious weakness of Clytemnestra's argument: the uxorious Menelaus was predisposed to forgive Helen (and to influence his brother to forgive her), whereas Agamemnon is not uxorious. *Hunc* both specifies the reference of *Atriden* and gives a clear contrast with *ille* 277. For *hunc* beginning a counter-statement in dialogue cf. *Pha* 233, and for the opening *hunc nulla* cf. *Ag* 593 *nullus hunc*. *Sed* was added to clarify the relationship of thought (as e.g. at *Med* 266 in A and 555 in recc.), and then displaced *hunc*; for explanatory material displacing the original in the archetype cf. 542 *in se* for *ignes* and 785 *Troia* for *domina*.[4]

Ag 300

Tarrant argues strongly for *clarae* (A) over *nostrae* (E). But the fact that E attributes this speech to the Nutrix, not Clytemnestra, perhaps makes it less likely that an original *clarae domus* would have been glossed *nostrae* in E. Further, though the chief point of the speech is indeed Aegisthus' unworthiness, there is also an issue of legitimacy (favouring *nostrae*) raised by *geniales toros* and *regi ac viro*. And *haec* (*domus*) seems to follow more comfortably after *nostrae domus* than after *clarae domus*. As part of A's stylistic alterations, "Seneca's . . . restrained epithets were replaced by more expressive ones" (Tarrant p. 62); replacement of the affective *illos* by *fortes* in A at 747 parallels replacement of *nostrae* by *clarae* here.

Ag 307

Clytemnestra is not (yet) bloodstained: consequently *cruenta* must be meant proleptically (so Zw.), indicating that she would become

[4] Alternatively Tarrant and Axelson propose that the subject of *ignovit Helenae* was originally Menelaus, and that a line referring to him has been lost before 273: Tarrant suggests "<But my husband's brother, himself a king,> forgave Helen." This approach is less satisfactory than Damsté's, since the reference of *Atriden* remains unspecified and unclear.

bloodstained if she accepted Aegisthus' offer of suicide. The point of *cruenta Tyndaris* is presumably to suggest a parallel with Helen, who allowed men to die for her.

Ag 315

For the conjecture *Parrhasis hospes* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 249.

Ag 322

"How can the Greeks address Apollo as victor?" asks Tarrant pertinently (on his line 326). Perhaps the answer is that one appeases a defeated god by assuring him that he was not defeated at all: compare Athena's treatment of the Furies at Aesch. *Eum.* 794ff. There may also be a specific literary source for *victor*. Tarrant on his 326ff. lists passages which link the bow and lyre as Apollo's attributes: the only passage which speaks of the god laying aside weapons for lyre on a particular occasion is Prop. 4.6.69–70 *bella satis cecini: citharam iam poscit Apollo/victor et ad placidos exuit arma choros*. (Elsewhere Apollo is called *victor* only at Luc. 3.206.)

A specific reference to the outcome of the Trojan War is softened or removed by the fact that *victor* and *invictus* are cult titles of some divinities and so appropriate in a hymn. Of Apollo cf. Host. *poet.* 4(6) *invictus Apollo arquitenens Latonius*.

Ag 332–34

The detail that Apollo sang a song of triumph after the defeat of the Titans has one precedent in Latin, at Tib. 2.5.9f. *qualem te memorant Saturno rege fugato/victori laudes concinuisse Iovi* (this to supplement Tarrant's note on his 339).

Ag 345

The transmitted *regis* is appropriate to divine control (*OLD* s.v. 7c and Tarrant on 355); for its conjunction with *manu* used metaphorically cf. *Phoen* 659 *qui vult amari, languida regnat manu*. By contrast *geris* (recc.) seems flat. *Bella manu geris* would suggest a physical involvement in warfare such as Juno prudently avoids in the Trojan War; its inappropriateness would be underlined if the phrase were to recall V. *Aen.* 7.444 *bella viri pacemque gerent, quis bella gerenda* (as Zw. 1969 264 suggested following Bentley).

_Ag_ 358f.

E's word-order *quae Dardanias cuspide turres saepe petisti* gives agreement between the endings of the first and second metra; in A's word-order *quae Dardanias saepe petisti cuspide turres* the agreement is between the first and third metra. These two patterns occur with roughly equal frequency in this ode.[5] But the first seems to be favoured when it yields a phrase consisting of main verb plus modifier which forms a natural monometer like *saepe petisti*, cf. 347 *accipe victrix*, 348 *sollemne canit*, 363 *redimita venit*, 369 *Lucina, iubes*, 375 *victrix numeras*.

_Ag_ 369

To Tarrant's citations (on his line 384) add V. *Aen.* 4.144 *Delum maternam invisit Apollo.*

_Ag_ 388

In the phrase *vasto gradu* one suspects an etymological play on the name Eurybates (as suggested by Mazzoli 1997 233–35), though phrases with *gradus* indicating haste are not unusual, as Tarrant shows.

_Ag_ 394

Supplex here indicates not 'in supplication' (for favours etc.) but 'in thanksgiving' (*supplicatio*), as at 807, *Herc* 876 and Hor. *Carm.* 3.14.8; this usage is not recognised in *OLD*.

_Ag_ 404

"Is Menelaus alive?" asks Clytemnestra—a tactless and ill-omened question, given that she know nothing yet of the storm: Eurybates' response *meliora votis posco* attempts to avert the omen, as Zw. notes. This question, like the ominous word *petitus* in 398 (v. Tarrant on 398a), hints at Clytemnestra's inner thoughts, since Menelaus if alive is a potential avenger of his brother. (405 then amends the lack of tact by asking a more proper question.) This point would be lost by emending the question into a blander one about Menelaus' whereabouts, with Birt and Tarrant.

The transmitted *tu pande vivat* is remarkable for its omission of an interrogative word. Axelson may be right to correct *vivat* to *vivit,*

---

[5] First pattern 318, 326, 331, 334, 346, 348, 356, 363, 369, 375; second pattern 312, 315, 321, 324, 335, 343, 359, 378.

which then begins a direct question.[6] But in view of the parallelism with *et pande teneat* I am inclined to make no change. Perhaps Sen. is constructing this indirect question by analogy with direct questions, which often have no interrogative word. He seems to experiment in this Act of *Ag* with unusual forms of questions, cf. next note and 579 *utrumne doleam laeter an?* with Tarrant ad loc.

Ag 414

E: *effare, casus quis rates hausit meas.*
A: *quis fare nostras hauserit casus rates.*

The use of *meas* in E's version is masterly: overtly it suggests Clytemnestra's identification with her husband (cf. Andromache at *Tro* 414, 810), but covertly her expectation of assuming power. No interpolator could manage such a touch, and A's *nostras* looks like a normalisation. The A interpolator also wanted to eliminate the anomaly of an indicative (*hausit*) followed by a subjunctive (*dispulerit*) in indirect question; but that anomaly is defended by the instances cited in Tarrant's note, to which add Ov. *Pont.* 3.3.53ff. *dic, precor, ecquando didicisti . . . an sit.* Most editors have rightly preferred E's version: Zw. 1977[2] 573 gave reasons for doing so, but in the OCT he followed Tarrant in preferring A.[7]

Ag 445

The phrase *quantum recedunt vela* is generally interpreted along the lines of Miller's "as the sails retreat." But this hardly fits either *vela* or *quantum*: *vela* is not used elsewhere in STrag as a metonymy for

---

[6] For a direct question juxtaposed with an imperative cf. *Herc* 1185 *fare: quis fudit domum?*, 1301 *pande, quid fieri iubes?*, *Pha* 894 *quis, ede, nostri decoris eversor fuit?*, *Oed* 275 *memorate: aperto Marte an insidiis iacet* (see ad loc.); for a direct question followed by an indirect cf. *Oed* 221f. *et quis peremptor incliti regis fuit?/quem memoret ede Phoebus* (admittedly without an imperative in the first line).

Axelson apud *KK* was hesitant about his own proposal, because he believed that questions juxtaposed with imperatives are always introduced by an interrogative pronoun. But one can see no reason for such a requirement, and *Oed* 275 is a counter-example.

[7] The postponement of *fare* in A's version, which Tarrant thought too stylish for an interpolator, could simply be imitated from examples such as *Pha* 894 *quis, ede, nostri decoris eversor fuit?* Tarrant considers E's word-order awkward because it "raises the expectation of an imperative with noun-object (*effare casus*)." But pronunciation of the *u* as short—if we remember that the text was heard rather than read silently—would immediately identify *casus* as nominative singular.

'ships'; *quantum* as a conjunction is used only here in STrag, and should have a more precise meaning than 'as'. Yet to translate "point out the lands fleeing *in proportion as* the sails retreat" would result in a pedantic and irrelevant insistence on the correlation between the ships' real motion and the lands' apparent motion.[8] Finally the viewpoint required by the narrative is that of the sailors, with which *recedunt* is not in accord.

I suggest that the meaning is quite different, viz. "insofar as the sails move back," i.e. the sailors spy the lands where gaps open between the crowding sails. The sails of this huge fleet are so numerous as to 'hide' or 'fill' the sea, cf. 41 *Iliaca velis maria texerunt suis*, 434, *Tro* 370 *tum mille velis impleat classis freta*; consequently they also tend to hide the land from those on board. For *quantum* used restrictively cf. e.g. Caes. *Civ.* 3.14.1, Ov. *Pont* 2.4.34. On this interpretation the phrase imparts a vivid detail, in keeping with the detailed observations in this section of the narrative. For glimpsing through small gaps cf. Stat. *Theb.* 2.530f. *scuta virum galeasque videt rutilare comantes/qua laxant rami nemus* ("where the branches open their foliage").

Ag 449

See above on *Herc* 778 (*tum/tunc*).

Ag 457

Doubts arise about the transmitted *parent*, but none is fatal. First, the verb might be thought to emphasise visibility, the opposite of what the context requires; but *dubia* qualifies the visibility. Second, *parent* is repeated in *apparet* two lines later; but ancient writers do not regularly avoid word repetition. Third, the (hazy) visibility of the mountains might be thought to conflict with Troy's smoke being the only thing visible in 458–59; but *et iam* 458 could mark a *subsequent* stage (Tarrant on 456ff.) by which the mountains have completely disappeared. I see no firm grounds, then, for discarding the paradosis, though I regret having to resist the stylistic attractions of Poggio's *pereunt*.

---

[8] The *quantum* clause is sometimes rendered as an indirect question, e.g. Studley "Our pilot doth espy/How far from any land aloof our sails recoiling fly." But this interpretation would require considerable emendation of the text.

Ag 458

Editors rightly set aside E's reading *id*, which yields the clumsy phrase *et id quod unum*. Zw. also rejects the A reading *iam* in favour of his conjecture *vix*, on two grounds. First, he believes that *apparet* 459 would necessarily denote coming into sight (the opposite of what the context requires) unless qualified by a negating word such as *vix*. But *apparere* can mean 'be visible' (e.g. *Pha* 660, *NQ* 1.1.11) as well as 'become visible:' the present context sufficiently excludes 'becomes visible,' especially as *iam*, since it follows the *iam* of 456, is already associated with decreasing visibility.

Second, Zw. believes that the triple *iam* of 460–61 marks a new paragraph starting with a new topic, viz. sunset (a function with which a *iam* in 458 would interfere). His text therefore attaches lines 456–59 to a paragraph beginning at 442, with which however they have little connection: 431–41 describes the first stage of the voyage, with the Troad close by; 442–55 an idyllic second stage, with land slipping away (444–45); 456ff. a third stage, with land all but invisible and ominous weather-signs.[9] Disappearance of the landscape, especially mountains, is naturally associated with dusk, e.g. Val. Fl. 2.39f. (at sea) *raptosque simul montesque locosque/ex oculis circumque graves videre tenebras*, Stat. Theb. 7.450f. *sol montibus omnis/erepsit rebusque dedit sopor otia fessis*. Admittedly the details of 456–59 also connote disappearance of the landscape through distance as one sails away, cf. *Tro* 1047–55, Luc. 3.4–7; I suggest that Sen. here unites 'disappearance through distance' with 'disappearance at dusk,' a natural combination.

Ag 471

Once the line is transposed after 489 with Tarrant, Zw.'s arguments against EA *perit* and for correction to *ferit* (1977 168–69) become irresistible in my view. *Caelum perit* would mean that the sky "disappears, becomes invisible," but that has already happened at 470–74; here we are concerned with the sea rising to astronomical heights and falling back mixed with rain.

---

[9] The black smoke of Troy is skilfully made ominous by association with the murky cloud of 462f.

Ag 479–84

Richter's excision of 481 is justified, as Zw. clearly establishes at 1977 170–72 and in *KK*; but it does not absolve the passage of awkwardness, which probably motivated the interpolation. First, despite *sua quisque mittunt tela* 477, only the north and south winds are given weapons. Second, the winds in 480 and 482^{b}–83 seem to be stirring up their own regions, not the Aegean. Third, the south wind, sometimes sandy and sometimes rainy, here seems to have both characteristics simultaneously. The interpolator was probably trying to alleviate the last two problems when he penned line 481, which is presumably meant to mean, "and it does not remain in the south [i.e. as Auster stirring up sands]: it becomes Notus heavy with rainclouds."

Ag 496f.

For the emendations *miserisque lucis tanta dulcedo, ut male/hoc lumen optent* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 249–50.

Ag 517

I would interpret, "Have we dared no noble deeds, that sea and waves are to carry us off?" This is an instance of the rhetorical figure in which a speaker applies to himself, indignantly or sarcastically (here the former), a description which he actually rejects: cf. e.g. V. *Aen.* 7.452f., 9.635, 10.92f., 11.392, Luc. 5.285f. *usque adeo civilibus armis/nescimus cuius sceleris sit maxima merces?* We then have restatement (as so often in STrag) in 518 but without the rhetorical ploy, i.e. *fortes* gives a true self-description (cf. e.g. V. *Aen.* 7.454f. following 452f.), while *ignava fata* spells out what was implied in 517 about a watery death. This interpretation yields a clear contrast between two groups of warriors, those who died gloriously at Troy (514–16) and those now faced with an inglorious death at sea—a contrast based on famous lines in Homer and Vergil (*Od.* 5.306–12, *Aen.* 1.94–101). *Ferent* (A) is an indignant future matching *consument* 518; for *ferre* = 'carry off' see *OLD* s.v. 35. For the thrust of a question contained in a syntactically subordinate element (participle) cf. *Herc* 438 *quo patre genitus caelitum sperat domos?*

Miller followed by Tarrant interprets *nil nobile ausos* literally, as referring to the inglorious folk who regularly voyage in safety: "Do sea and wave bear those who have dared naught noble?" (reading E's *ferunt*). This interpretation reduces the rhetorical force of 517 in

my view; it also blurs the contrast between two groups of warriors by introducing a third and different group, viz. inglorious travellers (presumably merchants). I suspect that the reading *ferunt* is an instance of E's tendency to read literally rather than rhetorically, and to 'correct' the text accordingly (v. my comm. on *Herc* 683f.).

Ag 526

Et can be used, as here, in contexts where we might say 'but also' or 'and yet' in English, i.e. in introducing an additional fact which is adversative in effect. Cf. 149 *piget prioris et novum crimen struis* (for which compare *Ep.* 9.17 [*sapiens*] *se contentus est et ducit uxorem*), 158, 580. Gronovius' punctuation (*vehit ista Danaos classis? et Troas vehit*) evinces a belief that *et* could only mean 'too' or 'also' here.

Ag 529–30

I follow M. Müller 1898 38f. in replacing *aut* (EA) with *haut (haud)* in 529. Tarrant's arguments against *aut* seem to me conclusive, while his reservations about Müller's proposal can be answered. The fact that Jove promised Pallas use of the thunderbolt in advance (Eur. *Tro* 80f.) implies that it seemed the only weapon capable of devastating the huge fleet in a sea-storm. Hence *quidquid haud hasta . . . haud aegide . . . potest* will signify not that "other arms have been tried and found wanting" (for which Tarrant finds no clear parallel in accounts of this episode), but that other arms were judged in advance to be inadequate. *Quidquid*, which Tarrant considers "somewhat inappropriate," may be little more than a poetic equivalent of *id quod* (as e.g. at *Phoen* 92, *Med* 921, 994, *Oed* 973, *Thy* 11); but more probably it could be rendered "all that," and its generality glances at the tradition that Pallas used the thunderbolt to cause widespread damage to the fleet (V. *Aen.* 1.39–43).

Müller's correction is paleographically plausible since *haut/haud* is repeatedly corrupted to *aut* (in E or A or both at *Herc* 345, 922, *Tro* 25, *Phoen* 186, 198, 338, *Med* 254, *Pha* 239, 492, 860, *HO* 1166). For *quidquid* with a negative cf. *Med* 567, *Ag* 272.

Müller also replaced EA *aut . . . aut* in 530 with *haut . . . haut.* The second of these is metrically doubtful: of some 50 uses of *haud* in the trimeters of the whole corpus, only two occur in the second foot (*Pha* 252, 427). Since *aegide* and *furore Gorgoneo* constitute a hendiadys, Gronovius' *et* seems more appropriate. At the beginning of the line one might retain the transmitted *aut* on the grounds that *aut* often

co-ordinates with a negative (below on *HO* 1166–67). But there is no example of *haud . . . aut* in the corpus, and anaphora of *haud* is more elegant (cf. *Phoen* 338f. *scelere defungi haud levi,/haud usitato*).

Ag 545

In E's version the line lacks a syllable: *superasse nunc pelagus atque ignes iuvat.* A has *se* after *nunc*: this gives *se superasse* as indirect statement dependent on *intonat*, with direct statement beginning after *ignes*. The awkwardness of this construction, which destroys the obvious parallelism of *superasse* and *vicisse*, leads one to conclude that *se* represents A's attempt to supplement a defective text.

Nunc can be defended in itself. First Ajax overcame the sea, in the sense of being "unconquered" by it (*solus invictus* 532); *now* he has survived lightning too, and so has conquered two elements, water and fire. The reference to elements is confirmed by 556, where he is finally conquered by an alliance of three elements, earth, fire and water.

What is needed, then, is a monosyllable before or after *nunc*, and *me* is the obvious candidate. Though impersonal *iuvat* is frequently used without a personal pronoun in STrag, a pronoun is used where required (*Ag* 972, *Thy* 1101). Here *me* will be emphatic, in keeping with Ajax' megalomania (cf. *non me fugavit* 547); "it pleases me to have overcome" shades into "it is pleasing that *I* have overcome." In view of this emphasis, I print *me nunc* with Düring (reported by Tarrant) and Watt 1989 339, rather than *nunc me* with V1 (Tarrant) and Giomini: cf. *Phoen* 332 *me nunc, Med* 817 *tu nunc*, and contrast *Pha* 710 *nunc me* where *nunc* is the more emphatic word.[10]

The conjecture *superasse saevum pelagus* occurred to Delz 1989 57, Hudson-Williams 1989 193 and Mayer 1991 267. Its drawback is evident, viz. that it unbalances the pointed parallelism between *pelagus* and *ignes* by attaching an epithet to one of these elements. The conjecture implies that the syllable *sae-*, written *se-* and following *superasse*, was omitted by haplography in the archetype; but no evidence is cited for *ae* spelt *e* in the archetype.

[10] Axelson's conjecture *nunc nunc* explains the corruption by haplography, but *nunc nunc* is used only with imperatives in STrag (*Herc* 498, *Tro* 107).

Ag 546

Tarrant, proposing to delete 545–46, considers *caelum Palladem fulmen mare* to be an "inane repetition" of *pelagus atque ignes*. But while *pelagus/ignes* contrasts two *elements* (see preceding note), *caelum/mare* makes a different contrast, between two *regions* of the cosmos; *caelum* also introduces a further category of Ajax' conquests, viz. gods. The unique form *Palladem* is defended by Axelson apud Zw. 1977 175 fn., Williams 1981 78f. and Hudson-Williams 1989 193.

Ag 566

Another case of corruption in a place-name. Tarrant explains why the transmitted reference to Calchedon (*hinc calchedona* A, *et calchedona* E) cannot stand, and why the emendation of recc. *hinc et Chalcida* is persuasive. I would add only a consideration of appropriateness. Chalcis is well known, both as "the chief city of Euboea throughout antiquity" (*OCD*[3]) and as fronting the notorious strait of Euripus (*Tro* 837f.); hence it matches the other celebrated places in this catalogue (563–67). Gronovius followed by Zw. preferred to write *hinc Anthedona*, but Anthedon's obscurity makes it inappropriate to the present context, particularly without an allusion to its sole claim to fame, viz. as Glaucus' birthplace. For an association of thought between Chalcis and Caphereus cf. *HO* 803f., which could have been suggested by the present lines.

Ag 603

Zw. adopts Axelson's *-que* without justifying it beyond the translation "und überhaupt." The question whether the transmitted *-ve* could be used in that sense—and indeed whether *-que* could be so used after negatives—needs further examination. Certainly *-ve* can be used with a restatement of a previous idea, rather than an alternative, cf. *Med* 592 *nec regi curat patiturve frenos, Herc* 1322, *Tro* 477, 899. But in none of these places is *-ve* attached to a summarising phrase such as *indomitum bellum*.

Ag 725

Falsa vates makes a new point as the speech's finale, for which 724–25[a] prepare. Objectively Cassandra's prophecies were accurate but fruitless (*vana Tro* 37, *irrita* Prop. 3.13.66), but *to the Trojans* (cf. dative *cui* in 724) they seemed false and unbelievable. Cassandra's apparent

acceptance of that assessment in *falsa vates* is ironic in itself, and doubly so because Troy's fall has proved her right.

The transmitted *ago* points these ironies well: "Now Troy has fallen: what business have I as a false prophetess?" (Studley translates "Why play I now the prophet cold, since Troy in dust doth lie?"). I.e. her prophecies related specifically to Troy's end, and they were false specifically for a Trojan audience. The recc. emendation *agor* is not only unnecessary, but makes the phrase less pointed. *Agor* can be amply parallelled in contexts of madness and possession, as Zw. shows, and for that reason it looks like a normalisation here.

Ag 731

To Tarrant the epithet *potentes* "seems without point." Perhaps it underlines the fact that this mere *pastor*, this *agrestis alumnus*, holds power over goddesses, however powerful. Similarly in 738f. an ignoble creature holds power over the king of beasts. Both visions correspond to the fact that the ill-born Aegisthus will soon have the upper hand over the rightful king.

Ag 738

For the conjecture *colla <u>summissus</u> iacet* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 250.

Ag 739

Doubts about the line as transmitted are rightly registered by Tarrant. Hendry 2000 317–20 suggests that *leo* has intruded (either from a marginal citation of *HO* 1057 *Marmaricus leo* or from a gloss on 738 *victor ferarum*) and has displaced the owner of the "ignoble tooth." He shows that the hyena would be an extremely apt symbol for Aegisthus. I add that reference to the hyena would also give special point to *ignobili sub <u>dente</u>*, since hyenas were known to have powerful teeth: Pliny *NH* 8.72 speaks of *crocotas velut ex cane lupoque conceptos, omnia <u>dentibus</u> frangentes*, cf. Diod. Sic. 3.35.10 τοῖς δὲ <u>ὀδοῦσι</u> πάντων ὑπεράγει. Hendry conjectures *Marmarici lupi* or *Marmarici canis*. Although neither he nor *TLL* cites an instance of *lupus* or *canis* used of the hyena, he gives three sources for the opinion that the *crocota* is a cross between dog and wolf (Pliny and Diod. Sic. locc. citt.; Strabo 16.4.16 [not 18f.]). I prefer *lupi* to *canis* because the symbolism derives, whether or not at first hand, from Aesch. *Ag*. 1258–60.

Ag 745
M. Müller 1898 39f. realised that E's garbled reading *ruptas bustis* points to an original *ratibus ambustis*. He pointed out that *ambustis* is more appropriate than A's *exustis*, since none of the ships was completely burnt (*Il.* 16.293f.).

Ag 746
For the genesis of the corrupt E reading, see below on *HO* 854.

Ag 755
Zw. and Axelson answer doubts about the line's authenticity. The underworld is similarly designated by a doublet including the Styx at *Herc* 23, 559f, *Pha* 147, 625, and *pariter* is frequently used in STrag to couple paired items.[11]

Ag 756
See the defence of the transmitted *terga* by Zw. 1987 89f., in addition to that of Tarrant ad loc.

Ag 759–74
If the text is correct, these lines describe various scenes in the underworld, rather as 743–52 do. Lines 769–74, introduced by *et ecce*, contain particular responses to the imminent murder, but 759–68 contain everyday scenes: since the scene in 766–68 is ongoing, and is linked to that in 759–64, the latter must describe the Furies' regular activity (for which cf. e.g. V. *Aen.* 6.570–72, 605–07), not preparations for inciting the murder of Agamemnon. The mouldering bones of 766–68 are not those of a specific mythical figure, but "deliberately anonymous, an item of appropriately gruesome furniture" (Tarrant). For such impressionistic, atmospheric details cf. *Herc* 762 with my comm. ad loc. There are anonymous sinners lying in the muck of the underworld at Ar. *Frogs* 145–51. Though it may seem odd that the scenes of 765–68 are tacked onto 759–64 by a bald *-que* and *et*, the following ode similarly uses *et* and *-que* to add new labours of Hercules to the list (837, 850, 852), as well as to expand on labours already under description.

If some lines are lost after 764, as Peiper suggested, lines 765–68

---

[11] *Herc* 23, *Phoen* 327, *Med* 46, 757, *Pha* 194, 849, 1101, 1178, *Ag* 434, 978.

are no longer tacked loosely onto 759–64, and the missing lines may have given guidance to the understanding of 766–68. Peiper's proposal is renewed by Zw., who believes that 759–68 describe scenes in the upper world, not the underworld; the Furies are now preparing to incite an imminent murder, as they do in *Herc* and *Med*. The lost lines will have identified the setting of 765–68 as the grove of Lerna, for the huge bones are those of the Lernaean Hydra in Zw.'s view. Such sinister groves are beloved of Sen., as Zw. shows. The case is a strong one, but not conclusive in my opinion. It is worth noting that at *Ag* 15ff. scenes of the underworld are similarly tacked on loosely, and that there too Zw. postulates loss of material that would specify the location.

Ag 777

E has *incertum* in agreement with *vulnus*; A has *incisa* in agreement with *cervice*. There would be little point to the phrase *vulnus gerens* if the bull had been killed cleanly as A's version implies; the animal would then be *caesus* and *mactatus*, not just *vulneratus*. E's reading is supported by the verbal closeness of this simile to V. *Aen*. 2.223f., also a simile: *qualis mugitus, fugit cum saucius aram/ taurus et incertam excussit cervice securim*. In Vergil the animal is sufficiently undamaged to rush away, but clearly the effect of an *incertum vulnus* would differ from case to case. Here we can assume from the context that the bull/Cassandra is stunned and sinks down. There is an implied contrast with a cleanly killed bull, which would fall poleaxed, cf. Ov. *Met*. 5.121f. (*repagula*) *ossibus inlisit mediae cervicis, at ille/procubuit terrae mactati more iuvenci*.

Ag 795

Strzelecki 58 counted 947 trimeters in STrag whose third foot consisted of a dactyl or tribrach; among them he found no instance of elision between the second and third syllable, except in the transmitted word-order here *ub(i) Helena est*. Schmidt's correction to *Helena ubi est* removes the anomaly without creating others,[12] and as a bonus produces a more expressive word-order with the emphatic word

[12] It involves elision at the beginning of the fourth foot, of which there are 15 instances in *Ag* alone (Zw. *Proleg*. 218), and prodelision before *est* within the fourth foot (four instances in *Ag*: 22, 144, 257, 293).

placed first. E. Fränkel's argument that the proper name excuses the metrical anomaly (Strzelecki 63) is not persuasive, since the proper name can be easily and elegantly accommodated without the anomaly.

Zw. 1980 192–94 conjectures *puta* for the transmitted *puto*. For his stylistic objection to the form *puto* see my note above on *Pha* 218. On the present passage he adduces two further arguments: (1) The first-person verb *puto* suggests a subjective view, not in keeping with Cassandra's authoritative vision as prophetess; (2) Cassandra is warning Agamemnon in 792–95 and 798–99 of his imminent danger, and the imperative *puta* is more forceful as a warning than *puto*. In my view Cassandra is not speaking here in full prophetic frenzy—which ended at 774—but rather giving a sardonic commentary, based on her personal knowledge of past and future, on Agamemnon's naive attempts to cheer her up. The phrase *mihi mori est securitas* bespeaks a personal rather than prophetic insight. Cassandra is registering the paradoxes of the situation, not warning Agamemnon; indeed she rejoices in his coming death as a recompense for the fall of Troy and Priam (756–58, 868–71).[13]

Ag 810

For correction of *educas* to *educans* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 250–51.

Ag 837

Hudson-Williams 1991 432–33 notes that this use of *gemini* for *three* offspring is unparallelled, and that Ovid uses the word of the 'twinning' of the Hydra's heads as each was cut off, *Met.* 9.90ff. *nec ullum . . . caput est impune recisum,/quin gemino cervix herede valentior esset*, 192f. *nec profuit hydrae/crescere per damnum geminasque resumere vires*. He therefore proposes that the "twin brothers" are the two heads that grew from each of the Hydra's severed necks. But *fratres* clearly fits Geryon better than the Hydra. It looks as if Sen. is devoting the paradox of 'birth through death' to the Hydra in 836 (cf. *Med* 702 *succisa serpens caede se reparans sua*), and the paradox of 'three in one' to Geryon (cf. *Herc* 487 *nec unus una Geryon victus manu*). Perhaps, then, he intensifies the play on numbers concerning Geryon by using *gem-*

[13] The "warning" she gives earlier at 732 *timete, reges, moneo, furtivum genus* is not a practical one, since it is addressed to Priam, who is dead, and Agamemnon, who is not present.

ini, which would normally connote two, in a context which forces it to mean 'born at the same birth' (*OLD* s.v. 1b).

Ag 857

The transmitted *omne* is deleted by M. Müller followed by Tarrant, but *omnis* is often used where an adverb such as 'completely' might be used in English, particularly in contexts of separation, e.g. Cat. 76.22 *expulit ex omni pectore laetitias*, Sen. *Pha* 428 *omne pellat ex animo decus*, *Oed* 620 *ab omni dissidet turba*. *Totus* is similarly used, e.g. Ov. *Fasti* 6.67f. *si toto mater me cedere caelo/iusserit*, Sen. *Med* 928 *materque tota coniuge expulsa redit*.

Ag 865–66

On the traditional interpretation of these lines, *Troia* is the subject of *concidit*: "under your leadership, Troy fell in as many days . . ." The second clause then consists of *quot annis*, which has to be expanded as follows: ". . . as <it took> years <for her to fall the second time>." This seems to me so awkward as to be barely Latin. And why should the Argive Chorus draw attention to the fact that Agamemnon has taken ten years to accomplish what Hercules achieved in ten days?

It seems preferable to regard *Troia* as the subject of the second clause only, and to take the subject of *concidit* to be the same as that of the two previous verbs, *succidit* and *sensit*, viz. the *mendax domus* of Laomedon: "under your leadership, it [Laomedon's house] fell in as many days as it took Troy years to fall." This gives a stylish inversion of word-order in 866, for which cf. e.g. Ov. *Tr.* 5.2.23 *litora quot conchas . . . habet*, Sen. *Med* 433 *remedia quotiens invenit nobis deus*, *Phoen* 428f. *sagitta qualis Parthica velox manu/excussa fertur*. For the construction of the first clause cf. *Tro* 128ff. *tecum cecidit,/summusque dies Hectoris idem/patriaeque fuit*, where *cecidit* similarly draws its subject from the preceding clause, while *tecum* takes up an earlier *tu* as *te duce* in our passage echoes *te duce* of 863.

How to understand this distinction between the fall of Laomedon's house and that of Troy? Hercules' enmity was directed specifically against Laomedon, who had cheated him; so far from wiping out the city, Hercules actually placed Priam on the throne, as Sen. recounts at *Tro* 718–31. His campaign can therefore be presented as a limited action, in contrast to the recent complete destruction of the city. True, most accounts of Hercules' action from *Il.* 5. 638–51 on do not limit it so, but describe it as a sack of the city. But the

limitation is useful in the present context to give credit to Hercules, while avoiding too direct a comparison with Agamemnon.

Ag 898–99

The transmitted text must be wrong since the simile lacks a subject, viz. the priest who is about to strike the bull. Tarrant gives reasons for accepting Bentley's conjecture *popa* for *prius*, which has the additional advantage of removing the pleonasm *prius . . . antequam*. Zw. 1978 156f., on the other hand, believes there is a lacuna between *oculis* and *antequam*, which he fills *exempli gratia* thus: <*et parat certum manu/ictum sacerdos*> (with *vulnus* as an alternative to *ictum*).

Zw. argues that that the movement of the *eyes* (*designat oculis*) in the simile as transmitted does not correspond closely enough to Clytemnestra's movement of her *hand* (*librat manum*). This seems overly logical, since the point of comparison between simile and apodosis is 'aiming a blow,' and we readily understand that coordination of eye and hand is necessary in that process. The verb of a simile does not necessarily designate precisely the same action, or the same stage of an action, as the verb of the apodosis. Thus at *Pha* 102f. (Phaedra's passion) *ardet intus qualis Aetnaeo vapor/exundat antro*, the verb *exundat* suggests a later development than *ardet intus*. Similarly at *Oed* 902–05 the bird of the simile 'collects' its scattered young whereas Daedalus only 'awaits' Icarus.

Ag 934

This line as transmitted has a spondaic fourth foot: *fidem secunda poscunt, adversa exigunt*. Yet it is expressive and clearly correct in this form, with *fidem* announcing the subject, and *secunda poscunt* stylishly contrasted by asyndeton with *adversa exigunt*;[14] in the form concocted to remove the spondee, *poscunt fidem secunda at adversa exigunt*, the line is flabby and unconvincing.

It is noteworthy that the sententia at *Pha* 264, *haud quisquam ad vitam facile revocari potest*, found only in E and rightly rejected by almost

[14] Tarrant's criticism of the line, that "a sharp distinction between such closely related words [as *poscunt* and *exigunt*] is quite improbable," is convincingly answered by Williams 1981 79: "That looks at such structures wrongly, as if meaning were objective and independent of context. Often in antitheses the structure itself enforces a distinction that would not occur to the listener independently of the structure."

all editors, has a spondaic second foot. Spondaic second and/or fourth feet are characteristic of the senarius, as opposed to Sen.'s iambic trimeter; and these two sententiae are comparable with the sententious senarii collected in the first century A.D. and attributed to Publilius Syrus, e.g. 77 *bis vincit qui se vincit in victoria*, 219 *Fortuna vitrea est: tum cum splendet frangitur.* That collection strongly influenced Sen.'s writing, and vice versa. It looks, therefore, as if *Pha* 264 and *Ag* 934, composed by one or more afficionados of Publilian style, were inserted in the margins of the archetype of the dramas; the first passed into the text of E only, the second into both E and A.[15]

The case is more complex at *Oed* 386 *solent extrema facere securos mala*, again a sententia with a spondaic second foot. This line is authentic in essence, since *malis* in *Oed* 387 picks up *mala* and would be flat without it. The most likely hypothesis is that Sen. wrote *suprema*, not *extrema* (so Avantius); excerpted as a sententia the line took on Publilian form, which then displaced the original form in Sen.'s text.

Ag 938

Herington in *Phoenix* 32 (1978) 270 notes that the only extant precedent for *Pisaei Iovis* appears to be Call. *Aet.* 76.2 Πισαίου Ζηνός; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 3.1.140f. *Pisaeus . . . Iuppiter*, *Theb.* 1.421 *Pisaeo . . . Tonanti.*

Ag 970

Most modern editors divide the line between Electra and Clytemnestra, and print A's *iustae* rather than E's *dixi* as the first word. The gist of Electra's *iustae parenti satis* must be that Orestes' safety (969) is enough for a proper mother, to which Clytemnestra replies that it is not enough for an *angry* mother. There are two difficulties concerning *iratae* in this version: first, it admits that Clytemnestra intends to kill Orestes, whereas elsewhere in this scene she cloaks herself in conventional moral values; second, it does not well denote her attitude to Orestes, since she wants to kill him to forestall revenge, not out of anger. It seems necessary, therefore, to accept E's *dixi.*[16]

---

[15] Was either sententia composed with the intention that it should become part of Sen.'s text? We cannot tell, but that clearly was the intention in the case of the interpolated sententia at *Tro* 1143[b]–44[a].

[16] Bothe, who proposed (independently of Poggio) division of the line between Electra and Clytemnestra, saw that his proposal necessitated acceptance of E's *dixi.*

Clytemnestra's 'anger' is now convincingly directed against Electra for her defiant withholding of information, and this anger motivates Clytemnestra's next statement, *morieris hodie*; similarly at 987 she demands of Electra "your brother or your life." In Electra's phrase *dixi parenti satis* the word *parenti* is loaded, implying "a true mother;" A's *iustae* spells out this implication, whether it originated as a gloss or a stylistic improvement. For loaded uses of *parens*, implying the behaviour or feelings such status entails, cf. e.g. *Tro* 608 *fingit an quisquam hoc parens, Pha* 998, 1199 *quid facere rapto debeas nato parens, HO* 1738.

Thy 3

E has *visas*, A *vivas*. The phrase *vivas domos* is improbable Latin for *domos vivorum*; and given A's penchant for altering the text, *vivas* is no doubt an attempt to correct a puzzling reading, viz. *visas*. Can sense be made of *visas?* Bothe took it with *male*: "Who shows Tantalus once more the gods' homes *that he saw to his undoing*?" But this does violence to the word-order, which associates *male* with *quis* and so with the verb of *quis*, viz. *ostendit*: "Who untowardly shows . . .?" (On the sense of *male* see above on *Ag* 496.) Heinsius' conjecture *invisas* restores both point and good word-order. (For loss of *in* or *in-* see above on *Herc* 100.) The phrase *deorum invisas domos* is now an exact analogue of *inferorum sede infausta* in line 1, contrasting the upper realm with the lower. Sen.'s other ghostly prologuist similarly begins with the point that both realms are hateful to him, *Ag* 3 *incertus utras oderim sedes magis*.

The phrase *deorum . . . domos* will probably carry two senses, viz. 'the upper world' generally and 'the gods' home' specifically (Tarrant ad loc.).[1] Tantalus hates the first because of the crimes of his descendants, and the second because his socialising with the gods led to his downfall (Tarrant p. 38); for his hatred of "those above" (in both senses) cf. 82f. *quando continget mihi/effugere superos?* On Bothe's interpretation the first of these senses is eliminated, since Tantalus did not just "see" the upper world, as if a visitor, but lived there. If *vivas* is read, the second sense of *deorum domos* is eliminated, since *deorum* now qualifies *quis*; the parallel between *inferorum sede* and *deorum domos* is also lost.[2]

Thy 10

Zw.'s arguments for reinstating the long-discarded MSS reading *vulneribus* are completely convincing. A comparable use of *vulnus*, in addition to those he cites, is *Tro* 48 *alto nefandum vulneri ferrum abdidit*.

---

[1] For a comparable double meaning see my comm. on *Herc* 505 *ad supera numina*.

[2] The best attempt so far to defend *vivas* is Hudson-Williams 1991 433. It is notable that, in the instances he gives of *domus* standing for its inhabitants (e.g. *Med* 945 *afflictae domus, Thy* 33 *violentae domus*), the reference is to a single specific house, not to houses in general.

Thy 33

In STrag passions, objects etc. frequently control people, rather than vice versa, e.g. *Oed* 793 *paterna regna discutient metum*, *Ag* 259 *nec regna socium ferre nec taedae sciunt*, *Herc* 502 *sceptra quid possint scies*, *Phoen* 584 *quid sceptra facient*? This rules out consideration of J. Grant's conjecture *repetantque profugi* (*CQ* 44 [1994] 282–83), which would also disrupt the balanced contrast of *excidant* and *repetant*, both governed by *regna*.

Thy 41–9

For discussion of these lines, and transposition of 46^{b}–48^{a} after 43^{a}, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 251–52. In his imitation of the passage in *Sejanus* II.2, Ben Jonson partially anticipates my transposition by placing domestic adultery before the outward flow of crime:

> Adultery! It is the slightest ill
> I will commit. A race of wicked acts
> Shall flow out of my anger, and o'erspread
> The world's wide face.

Thy 51

This line alludes to the darkness that will follow Thyestes' meal. The adjective for *nox* is *alia* in E, *alta* in PT, *atra* in CS. Paleography suggests that either *alia* or *alta* is original, since each could represent a corruption of the other. Choice between them is not easy. *Nox alta fiat* follows naturally from lines 49–50, conveying that the present starlit night must become deep, i.e. unlit, night. But *excidat caelo dies* then comes as a puzzle, since it is not now day; we have to re-construe the line as a hysteron proteron, with *nox alta fiat* awkwardly representing both the result of *excidat caelo dies* and an intensification of the current ordinary darkness.

Nox alia fiat will mean, "let there be another night," i.e. one subsequent to the present night.[3] This fits better with *excidat caelo dies*, which in effect says the same thing in different terms. Admittedly at first sight *nox alia fiat* does not follow on so clearly from 49–50 as *n. alta f.* But perhaps *alia* means "other" in the sense not only of 'subsequent' but also of 'different in kind,' i.e. more dark and unnat-

[3] I agree with Zw. that *nox alia fiat* could not mean "let there be another level of darkness," i.e. *nox duplicetur* (as Heinsius proposed), without more help from the context.

ural. Compare 827, where *utinam nox sit* implies, "Would that it were an *ordinary* night!"

Thy 58–59

For elucidation of these lines, and the suggestion that *Thyestes* has displaced some such noun as *stuprator*, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 252–53.

Thy 139

I would interpret the paradosis so: "Considerations of right have had no effect [in stopping crimes in this family], nor has communal wrong." The latter might have been expected to stop crime by having a deterrent effect, or simply by running its course and leaving no-one capable of continuing; the text does not specify, nor need we.

Tarrant gives examples of *aut* "joining subjects of a negatived verb" in other authors. Instances in STrag include *Tro* 38f., *Med* 412, *Pha* 168, 208, 547f., *Oed* 721, *Ag* 594, *Thy* 361. See also below on *HO* 1166f.

Thy 145

The son running for his father's kiss recalls Lucr. 3.895f. *nec dulces occurrent oscula nati/praeripere*, a picture of family affection which highlights Tantalus' coldheartedness by contrast.

Thy 207

For the apparent inversion see above on *Phoen* 79.

Thy 238

E has *generis*, A *nostri*. I follow Axelson and Zw. in taking *nostri* to be right, and to have the sense 'of what is mine' (*rerum nostrarum*, Axelson). I would add that the usage is unusual and revealing, since *pars nostri* would usually mean 'part of *me*' (cf. *Tro* 378, *Pha* 1267). As the antithesis of a Stoic *sapiens*, Atreus identifies himself completely with the externals that he goes on to list. Compare Atreus' similarly striking use of *Thyestes totus* in the sense 'Thyestes and his sons' (495).

Nostri could, of course, be an intrusive gloss on *generis*, but the combination of boldness and subtlety in the usage in this context speaks for its authenticity. It is clearly not the work of the A interpolator.

Thy 240

I see no need to write *et* with Heinsius. One could attach the transmitted *est* by punctuation either to *dubius sanguis* or to *certi nihil*: each option is already found in the MSS (see Pierrot's *Animadversiones*). I prefer the second option, since *est* frequently appears in points about 'the last remaining resource, possession, possibility etc.,' e.g. *Herc* 957 *immune caelum est,* 1268 *hoc unum meum est, Tro* 453 *haec una est salus, Med* 426 *sola est quies.*

Thy 267–68

My note at *CQ* 54 (2004) 253 explains the need to correct the transmitted *animus* to *animo* with Leo.[4] Giardina's app. crit. indicates that he regards *animus* as protected by Rossbach's brief defence (1904 363). The first two sentences of that defence are answered in my *CQ* note. Rossbach's final sentence is, "Außerdem is *animus* ein passenderer Subjekt zu *instatque pigris manibus* (269) als *nescio quid*." This might be true in another writer, but not in STrag, where action is often spoken of as controlled by independent agencies, or by passions objectified as independent agencies. For examples with *manus* cf. *Phoen* 275, *Med* 749 *vestras hic dies quaerit manus*, 952 *repetit invitam manum/antiqua Erinys, Thy* 243 *manus poscuntur*, 276f. *manum/impelle nostram.* From 260 Atreus is claiming to be controlled by a force other than himself.

Thy 272

The A reading *uterque faciat* is clear and forceful: each brother is to perform the deed, Atreus by killing, Thyestes by eating (so already Farnaby). The conceit of Thyestes as an active participant returns particularly at 285f. E's reading *quod uterque faciat* yields a clause dependent on 271: "The deed is worthy of Thyestes and worthy of Atreus—worthy of being performed by each of them." The sense is much as in A,[5] but A expresses it more stylishly, with the point and

[4] Herrmann's app. crit. attributes the emendation *animo* to Madvig as well as Leo. I have not had an opportunity to check this attribution.

[5] Zw. does not think so. In defending E's version he writes, "Es geht nicht darum, daß beide Brüder an dem Verbrechen mitwirken . . . sondern daß es ein Verbrechen von der Art ist, wie es beiden Brüdern gut ansteht." This seems to me to exaggerate the difference betwen the two versions, by attributing to A a suggestion of collaborative action.

parataxis favoured by Sen. Though STrag twice has *dignus* governing *qui* + subjunctive (*Tro* 308, *Thy* 876), that construction is not combined with the more usual *dignus* + ablative.

Thy 275–76

Parens sororque is usually taken to refer to Procne and Philomela. But the phrase is more pointed, and better fits the singular imperatives *inspira* etc., if *soror* too refers to Procne, as sister and avenger of Philomela. Then *causa est similis* notes the specific parallel between Atreus seeking revenge for his debauched wife, and Procne seeking revenge for her debauched sister. For the two words applying to Procne cf. Ov. *Met.* 6.633, and to Althaea (again concerning revenge) Sen. *Med* 779–80 *piae sororis, impiae matris facem/ultricis Althaeae vides.*

Thy 280

The abruptness of *ubinam est* characterises Atreus, and need not be queried: the use of *ubinam* is exactly parallelled at *Ag* 398, where it again expresses impatience that the person in question is not yet present to suffer revenge (see Tarrant on *Ag* 398[a]).

Thy 281

Axelson's conjecture *servatur* is initially attractive because of the similarity of *Herc* 740 *servat innocuas manus*, also of a king. But the transmitted *versatur* is persuasively defended by Hudson-Williams 1989 194–95.

Thy 290

The standard line-numbering is based on the order of lines in A, which seems satisfactory. E's placement of 290 after 293 is an obvious error, originating no doubt in the fact that three lines in this passage begin *hac spe*. Two descendants of E (M and F) 'correct' E's error by setting 290 before 293.[6] Leo's inclination to follow suit

[6] M writes 290 before 293. In F 290 is written after 293, but 'b.' is inserted (in a different script) before 293, and 'a.' before 290, to reverse the order. The 'correction' could have been made by M and F independently, or it could go back to Σ. Unfortunately fine details including the 'b.' and 'a.' in F, though clear on microfilm, are not visible in the photographs of M and F in C. Monteleone, *La pagina e la sapienza: memoria sulle "antilabài" nei manoscritti senechiani*, Fasano 1989, respectively Tav. XII.1 and XII 3a.

("*ponendus fort. post v. 292*") reflects his belief that E is closer to the truth, even in error, than A. To set 290 before 293 (as Tarrant and Zw. do) involves supposing that the line has been displaced separately, and differently, in E and A. But Ockham's Razor requires the most parsimonious hypothesis, viz. that the line has been displaced in one tradition only.

Tarrant sees stylistic advantages in placing 290 before 293. I find A's word-order effective since it functions like a *tricolon abundans*, with the second item longer than the first, and the third promising to be longer still, but cut off by the paradox *fratrem videbit.*

Thy 299^b–302^a

I follow Courtney 1985 299–300 in believing that these lines were interpolated, with the intention of bringing Atreus' plans into conformity with the beginning of the following Act, where Thyestes' sons are indeed keener on return than their father. The following difficulties of thought and style justify excision.

1. Courtney and Axelson rightly see a disjunction of thought after 302^a, since 302^b–04 are concerned with Atreus' own motivation, not the possible influence on him of his sons. Axelson's solution is to postulate the loss after 302^a of two hemistichs, whose gist was <*sed libens frater, reor,/per se ipse veniet*>. But the thought seems both flat and inapposite, since the context would require "the sons in turn will persuade Thyestes." It is noteworthy that if 299^b–302^a are removed, 302^b–04 follow convincingly and in a stylish chiasmus from 299^a: *regni furor* takes up *Argos regat*, and the hardships of exile in 303 take up 297–98. The speech now focusses on Thyestes' motivation, as does the whole of the dialogue from 286 to 306.
2. The flat use of the proper name *Thyestes* is doubtful in 300 as in 58. Admittedly in 300 the name has some slight point, to distinguish the father from his sons, but one would have expected Sen. in his allusive fashion to write e.g. *ipse* or *pater*.
3. The unpoetic form *eius* is not parallelled in STrag. Its rarity would not *per se* be a ground for suspicion, as Tarrant points out, but it fuels suspicion in an already suspect passage.
4. *Prece* at the beginning of 302 is an awkward and unskilful repetition of *preces* 299 (so Courtney, Tarrant and Watt 1989 340), yet it is surely the reading of the archetype. (Like most critics, I regard A's *precomm-* as an error for *pre*[*ce*]*comm-*.)

5. The subject of the verb in 302[a] is uncertain. E has a first-person ending, which may or may not mean that Atreus speaks as if acting through his sons; this *-bo* ending is in hiatus with the following *hinc*. A has a third-plural ending *-bunt*: Tarrant takes the subject to be the *preces* of 299 (reading *praecommovebunt* after A), but this seems awkward; others take the subject to be Atreus' sons.[7]

Thy 309

Because of Sen.'s gnomic and paratactic style, it can be difficult to decide on attribution of lines, as here where 309 is spoken by Atreus according to E, but is part of the Satelles' speech in A. *Praecepta* perhaps supports A's arrangement. If spoken by Atreus, *praecepta* would mean 'instructions' (for deceiving Thyestes); but if spoken by the Satelles, it will have a more general moral sense, 'teaching,' which better matches the metaphors *doces* and *magistrum* in the following lines. For the notion that young men are compliant with bad moral influence in general cf. Hor. *AP* 163 *cereus in vitium flecti* (cited by Pierrot). Furthermore Atreus' question *ne mali fiant times?* works best as a response to fear of the sons' general moral corruption (i.e. 309 spoken by the Satelles), rather than to fear of a specific manifestation of evil by them (i.e. 310–11).

Thy 316[a]–21[b]

Here the decision about attribution is even more difficult: does all of this speech belong to the Satelles, or does part of it belong to Atreus? In 320 E's *-que* is forceful and idiomatic in the sense 'And so . . .?', drawing out an implication of the previous statement in a pointed question: see *Herc* 430 with my comm., and for the comparable use of *et* see above on *Thy* 58–59. (By contrast A's *-ne* is flat, and *-ne* is little used in *Thy* and *Phoen*.)[8] This use of *-que* or *et* usually responds to *another's* statement (*Pha* 673 is an exception), which suggests that Atreus has just finished speaking: if so, E's attribution to him of 317[b]–19 must be right. (A's attribution to him of 319 alone convinces no-one.)

---

[7] Perhaps E wrote *-bo* because of doubt about the subject of *-bunt*; alteration of the text by E similarly causes hiatus at *Herc* 1284. Or *-bo* could be original, and the hiatus another sign of unskilful interpolation; in that case A's *-bunt* is designed to get rid of the hiatus, like A's reading *de* for *a* at *HO* 1794.

[8] Only *Thy* 731 and 1032 in alternative questions, and *Phoen* 579.

This arrangement results in an effective dramatic development in my view. Up to 316 Atreus has insisted that his sons will be accomplices, with the implication that they will be so knowingly. Now he takes two steps back: first, he concedes that his sons should not know; second, he concedes that they should be protected from guilt. (The Satelles' questions 316[b]–17[a] and 320–21[a] function simply to elicit these concessions.) Then, in revulsion against such un-Atrean feebleness, he insists on their being fully aware and incriminated (324–30[a]). Finally, to ensure his plot's success, he returns to the first concession, that they should be unwitting.

***Thy* 374–75**
For the interpretation see Nisbet 1990 106–08.

***Thy* 388–89**
Leo 2.383 offers a strong argument for deletion of these lines, namely that lines 381–87 prepare specifically for line 390, so that 388–89 constitute an interruption. The issue is one of *gaining* kingship, addressed negatively and then positively: "one has no need of cavalry, armour etc. [in order to gain kingship]: one bestows such kingship on oneself."

The topic of kingship is treated in two sections. The first (344–68) defines what constitutes a true king: not wealth, but freedom from fear, ambition and greed. This definition is essentially static, except for the final movement to death (367–68). The second section dramatises the topic with an imagined contest for kingship: though 'kings' in the conventional sense forgather and compete (*conveniant* 369, *certet* 376), it is a *bona mens* that possesses, or gains possession of, kingship (*possidet* 380). This 'active' treatment of the topic continues in the issue of gaining kingship: not as conventional kings do (381–87), but by self-bestowal (390).

The nature of lines 388–89, then, is not in keeping with the 'active' quality of the second section (369–90), but echoes the static definitions of the first section (344–68). In fact 388 *rex est qui metuit nihil* largely duplicates 348 *rex est qui posuit metus*, and looks to be modelled on it. The motive of the interpolator was perhaps to explain the *hoc* of 390 ('*this* kind of kingship'), which has in fact been explained by everything since line 343.

***Thy* 467**

If E's *iungenda* is right, the best interpretation seems to be Gronovius' gloss *diei continuanda.* For this sense of *iungo* see *OLD* s.v. 10a; Gronovius supplies Justin 12.13.7 *cum diei noctem pervigilem iunxisset*, similarly in a context of partying. The gerundive suggests that the decadents feel an obligation to waste night as well as day, with no respite allowed for normal living. Tarrant translates, "night is given to drinking to be joined to it," but the gerundive adds little to *datur* here; the suggestion of unnatural linkage which Tarrant finds in *iungenda* is already present in the context. A's *ducenda* aims at clarity and simplicity, often the hallmarks of A interpolation.

***Thy* 591**

For transposition of this line after 592 see *CQ* 54 (2004) 253–54. With this transposition the sudden change of weather is emphasised through contrastive juxtaposition of boats endangered by storms and 'playing' on calm seas. The same contrastive juxtaposition and the same metaphor occur at *Ep.* 4.7 *eodem die ubi luserunt navigia, sorbentur.*

***Thy* 688**

In terms of usage, either E's *-que* or A's *-ve* would be acceptable here: for *-que* used after an initial negative see above on *Pha* 97, and for *-ve* so used cf. e.g. *Tro* 1163, *Ag* 304, 844. But corruption of *-ve* to *-que* is much more probable than the opposite corruption. Where EA divide between *-que* and *-ve* elsewhere, Zw. judges *-ve* to be correct (*Med* 409, 412, 579, 718, *Pha* 1225, *Oed* 1007, *HO* 1350): why not here too?

***Thy* 736**

Zw.'s conjecture *impiger* for EA *piger* is initially attractive, since it makes a better match between the lion's behaviour and Atreus' murderous energy. But Billerbeck *SSU* 92 fn. 199 persuasively defends the paradosis: the point of comparison is the lion's repeated attacks, to which *dente iam lasso piger* is concessive just as 734 is. (*Piger* no doubt refers to the effects of feasting, cf. Mart. 7.27.2 *aper . . . ilice multa iam piger.*) The juxtaposition of adjectives of similar meaning (*lasso piger*) is characteristic of Sen.'s style: see my comm. on *Herc* 536 and Canter 173, and cf. *Oed* 182 *piger ignavos*, 547 *limosa pigrum, Ag* 161 *pigro fixa.*

Thy 771

At the end of the line E has *magis* while A has *gemant*. A's reading creates an obvious difficulty: what now is the subject of *gemuere* in 772? If the implied subject is '*both* flesh and flames,' this would need to be indicated in some way, since it counters the either/or question in 771. Furthermore, it would be confusing, immediately after the statement that the liver made a noise (*stridet iecur* 770), to ask if the flesh (*corpora*) made a noise. A's *gemant* was inserted to remove the anomaly of an indicative (*gemuere*) in indirect question, just like A's *hauserit* for *hausit* at *Ag* 414 (see there).

Since the transmitted *dicam* makes good sense, there is no justification for altering it to *dicas* with N. Heinsius. The second person singular is admittedly more common in such phrases; but to alter *dicam* on those grounds alone would smack of normalisation.

Thy 777

As Zw. points out, if *ruptum* (EA) is read, *diem* will have two senses: construed with *ruptum* it will have a temporal component, referring to the course of the daylight; construed with *merseris*, it will refer to the sun itself as source of daylight. Here the effect of such a conflation of meanings is clumsy, whereas *raptum* (recc., cf. 638, 793) gives an image consistent with *merseris*.

Thy 781

Tränkle makes the persuasive suggestion (recorded in the app. crit. of the 1991 OCT) that *est* has dropped out after *gravisque vino*. *Gravis* should not be syntactically parallel to *madidus*, since it does not explain *nitet* as *madidus* does. Rather Thyestes' satiety with wine should be syntactically parallel to his satiety with food (viz. the following clause), as at 899f., 913 and 973.

Thy 789

EA *parens* cannot be right, since the father of earth and heaven is Jupiter not the sun, cf. *Herc* 1054 *parens aetheris alti*, *Pha* 468 *maximus mundi parens*, *Ag* 382 (with Tarrant's note on his line 400), 581, *Thy* 90. N. Heinsius corrects to *potens*, since the sun "has power over" earth and heaven. Cf. Pliny *Nat.* 2.6, where the sun is described as *amplissima magnitudine ac potestate, nec temporum modo terrarumque, sed siderum etiam ipsorum, caelique rector*. For the corruption cf. *Herc* 300, where recc. have *frugum parens* for the transmitted and correct *frugum potens*.

Thy 835

The transmitted *aeternae* is inappropriate both to the general context, in which the sun's demise seems probable, and the immediate context, in which line 837 requires a reference to seasonal changes, not a connotation of permanence. N. Heinsius' *alternae* solves both difficulties. *Alternae* will refer to the sun's alternation with night, but also to the succession of sunrises through the year, becoming later in winter and earlier in summer. For *alternus* of a succession through the year cf. Man. 1.259 (the zodiacal signs) *solemque alternis vicibus per tempora portant*, 3.523.

Thy 865

Zw. adopts Wakefield's conjecture *frangesque* for EA *frangetque* without comment. Baden's justification for it, viz. that Capricorn lying beneath Aquarius' arm-level (Hyg. 27 *suppositus Aquarii manui sinistrae*) could not break the urn in his fall, is nugatory. For Sen. is envisaging the zodiacal signs as falling *in the direction in which the sun moves through the zodiac* (given by Man. 1.263–74): hence Taurus can strike against the subsequent Gemini and Cancer (852–54), and Capricorn can strike against the subsequent Aquarius, breaking his urn.

Thy 882–84

Comparable thinking is found at Cic. *Rep.* 7 and Luc. 7.134–36. Pierrot ad loc. cites Luc. 2.289, Sen. *Ep.* 71.15, *Nat.* 6.2.9 and 6.32.8.

Thy 1008

The idea, like many in Sen., is first presented cryptically (how could the Earth plunge into itself?), then clarified by restatement (*regna abripis* and later *tuam demitte vallem*: i.e. *part* of herself). So Pierrot explains, correctly.[9]

Rupta could be nominative or ablative. If nominative it almost certainly goes with *mergis*: "do you not break open and plunge . . .?" But the third-foot caesura coming after *mergis* inclines us to assume the sense is complete, so that *rupta* has the air of an afterthought.

[9] Neither Damsté's *noctemque* nor Schmidt's *tenebrasque* carries conviction as a replacement for the transmitted *te nosque*. Darkness is frequently mentioned in connection with the underworld because it constitutes the underworld's distinguishing feature, but that is not the case in the present dramatic situation. The omission of an object for *mergis*, brought about by these conjectures, is also awkward.

If ablative, *rupta* modifies *via* in an ablative absolute: "and by breaking open a huge pathway." *Ingenti via* is more convincing so than it would be unmodified. For the familiar phrase *viam rumpere* see *OLD* s.v. *rumpo* 4a, adding Sil. 15.782 and Stat. *Theb.* 8.468 from Pierrot. True, this method of construing involves postponed *et*, a rarity in Senecan trimeters (see above on *Herc* 233), but on balance I find it preferable.

***Thy* 1018**

The grains of sand are 'roasted' (*tostas* Raphelengius) by fiery Phlegethon, as grains of *far* etc. are roasted before milling: for this process, familiar in the ancient world, see Mynors on V. *Georg.* 1.267 *nunc torrete igni fruges, nunc frangite saxo*. (This instance of roasting seems worth adding to those cited by Tarrant.) Gronovius cites Sil. 13.837 *ustas sub gurgite cautes/egerit*, also of Phlegethon.

***Thy* 1021**

In STrag this is the only example of hiatus within the trimeter (*superi accipe*) that has any likelihood of being right. Ps.-Sen. offers a possible parallel at *HO* 1402, where again the hiatus occurs at the speaker-change (see ad loc.). In *Thy* editors accept B. Schmidt's <*iam*> *accipe*, which eliminates the hiatus.

***Thy* 1033**

Of conjectures that replace *servantur*, Axelson's *vorantur* is paleographically more persuasive than the otherwise excellent suggestions of Tarrant and Zw., viz. *scinduntur* and *laniantur* respectively. But are *beluae* sufficiently distinct from the *ferae* later in the line? (At Ov. *Met.* 13.917 *belua* is qualified by *fera* as an adjective.) And what *beluae* might one find in the vicinity of Argos?[10]

Dogs are often mentioned as creatures that devour unburied bodies (e.g. Hom. *Il.* 22.339–54, Soph. *Ant.* 207, 697–98, Cat. 108.5, Ov. *Ibis* 169), and *servantur* would be appropriate of food set aside

---

[10] *Beluae* could denote sea creatures, as in the word's other occurrences in STrag (*Pha* 351, 1047) and all occurrences in Ov. *Met.* (4.689, 728, 5.18, 11.366, 13,917). But why would Thyestes imagine that Atreus has transported the bodies to the coast? Bentley perceived the difficulty of distinguishing *beluae* from *ferae*, as is shown by his conjecture *an beluas servantur ut pascant feras?*

for domestic creatures rather than thrown out for wild ones. Is there a synonym for dogs that might have been corrupted into *beluis*, or glossed by it?

Thy **1052**

The subjunctives *facias* and *reponas* are of the kind often found in generalizing second-singular verbs when the clause is introduced by an indefinite relative word. But L. Mueller 1894 284 and Strzelecki 43 agree that a sequence of five short syllables in the fourth and fifth feet is unparallelled and highly unlikely. Is *facias*, then, a dissyllable with *i* pronounced *y?* Mueller 282–84 characterises this form of synizesis as foreign to iambic and trochaic verse, and rejects possible examples here and *HO* 1342 as corrupt. Further, it is difficult to see why Sen. would have employed so rare a licence to accommodate so common a verb as *facere*.

The explanation may be that *facias* is an intrusive gloss which has dispaced the more recherché word that it glossed. I have considered conjecturing *patres*, which would have invited a gloss because of its resemblance to a noun. (For *tr* 'making position' cf. 41, 283, 310.) But *patrare* is rare in verse (once each in Plautus, Lucretius and Persius).[11]

Thy **1074**

See *CP* 84 (1989) 247, where the conjecture *etiam sine astris* is offered in place of attempts to explain the transmitted *tu quoque sine astris*.[12]

---

[11] Mueller conjectured *ut facias*, with *ut* = 'when'; this would necessitate *ut reponas* in 1053. But the danger of confusing these clauses with purpose clauses is too great.

[12] One earlier such attempt, seen in Pierrot, involved taking *Nox Tartarea* 1071 as literally the darkness of the underworld (with *Tartarea* vocative): *tu quoque sine astris* was then taken to compare the regularly starless condition of the underworld with that of the currently starless upper world. This view influences the translations of Harris, Watling and Herrmann, though the latter expresses doubts about the text. In fact the *Nox* must be that of the upper world, and *Tartarea* is ablative with *nube*, whereas metre requires *atra* to be vocative: "Night black with Tartarean fog."

This page intentionally left blank

[SENECA], *HERCULES OETAEUS*

HO 22

The paradosis has *vidi*, followed by *silentum* in E and *regentem* in A. Axelson in *KK* (contra *Korr.* 9) accepts A's *regentem* together with Herrmann's conjecture *vici* for *vidi*, on the strength of *Herc* 48–49 *et opima <u>victi regis</u> ad superos refert/. . . parum est reverti.* But those lines are part of a prejudicial account of Hercules' labours by Juno, who implies that after 'conquering' Jove's peer Dis, Hercules will attack Jove himself (53, 65). The theme of the present list of Labours is very different, viz. that the world is pacified and all evils have surrendered (*omne concessit malum* 14). The "ruler of the fates/death" could not be accounted such an evil, especially in address to his brother Jove. But "the fates of the silent dead" verge on evil (cf. e.g. *Herc* 858–63); anyway Hercules does not claim to have conquered them, only beheld them—with the implication that he survived the experience (cf. *Herc* 606 *vidi inaccessa omnibus*). For *silentum* cf. *Med* 740 *comprecor vulgus silentum.*

HO 31

Though *animus* can sometimes be translated 'anger' (cf. 287) it necessarily retains some connotation of 'spirit,' so that the idea of denying one's *animus* to someone else is close to preposterous. The meaning could have been conveyed more clearly by writing *odium noverca.* Nevertheless the clumsiness does not seem beyond the *HO* author. It is somewhat compensated for by the neat chiasmus *mundus feras/animum noverca*, parallelled immediately below by *nato patrem/astra forti.*

Of conjectures the best is *animo novercae* (Marruzzino), i.e. "if the world denies beasts to my stepmother's angry spirit." For the notion of Juno's supply of monsters running out, Marruzzino[1] compares *Herc* 40 *monstra iam desunt mihi* and *HO* 52–54 *iam vacuus aether non potest <u>odio tuae</u>/sufficere <u>nuptae</u>, quasque devincam <u>feras</u>/<u>tellus</u> timet concipere nec monstra invenit.*

---

[1] S. Marruzzino, "Seneca, *Hercules Oetaeus*, vv. 26 ss; 836 ss.," *Vichiana* 14 (1985) 343–50.

HO 56

The transmitted *nunc* gave no trouble to editors before Bothe, and could be right. The emphasis of the passage is on the present situation: the world is *now* producing no more beasts to be conquered (52–54); in their absence, Hercules himself is *now beginning* (*iam coepit*) to seem like a monster, since he has *now* so often fought beasts and in beast-like style, unarmed and bare-handed (*nudus* 57, *solae manus* 58). It appears not impossible that the *HO* author, with his unrefined Latin, might use *nunc* so in the sense of *iam*.

Schenkl's *non* for *nunc*, printed by Zw., obscures the point. It would imply "I have crushed every last one" (for this use of *non* in rhetorical questions see *KK* on *Oct* 503). Hercules' point here, however, is not the completeness of his conquests, but their sheer number, including even monsters he was not commanded to conquer (61–62). Watt 1989 340 prefers to write *confregi* for *nunc fregi*, postulating imitation of *Herc* 272 *saeva iusta sceptra confregit manu*, the one use of *confringere* in the corpus. But since the *HO* author uses plain *frango* so persistently (20 times elsewhere in the play!), one hesitates to alter this instance; for *frango* used of crushing beasts etc. cf. 6, 20, 997 (*mala* again), 1814, 1894. If emendation is thought necessary, Bothe's *enim* for *nunc* seems preferable.

HO 70

At ipse, which Gronovius attributes to E, is actually his own correction: EA have *at ille*. The transmitted reading is certainly startling, since *at/ast ille* normally signals a change of subject, as at 510, 808, 1642, 1736. But it is partially parallelled by 1752 *ast illi*, where *illi* refers to the subject of the immediately preceding clause;[2] perhaps, then, it is an instance of this play's odd Latinity.

HO 87–91

For the proposal to transpose these lines before 79, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 240.

HO 102

Rutgers' conjecture *acta* appears to be supported by Aesch. fr. 25e 13f. Radt Κηναίου Διὸς/ἀκτὴν, Soph. *Trach.* 237–38 ἀκτή τίς ἐστ'

[2] Likewise *ille* or *illa* continues the preceding subject at 1496, 1611, 1626.

Εὐβοιίς, ἔνθ᾽ ὁρίζεται/βωμοὺς τέλη τ᾽ ἔγκαρπα Κηναίῳ Διί, 752–53 ἀκτή τις ἀμφίκλυστος Εὐβοίας ἄκρον/Κήναιόν ἐστιν. But *acta* is unusual in classical poetry (*Korr.* 106 fn. 80), and Bothe pointed out that *ora* is a more persuasive correction paleographically for EA *ara*. Meaning is also relevant: *acta* 'seashore' is not the same as ἀκτή 'headland,' and would not be appropriate to the lofty situation of the temple (*tollens* here, cf. 782 *rupe celsa*). The Greek passages cited above show that the phrase *Cenaei Iovis* applies primarily to the coast, as the word-order suggests, though it could apply to the temple also (783).

HO 123

The transmitted *stamus* could well be sound. *Stare* can mean 'to continue to stand,' physically or metaphorically (*OLD* s.v. *sto* 15–17). Hence it can connote 'to remain standing, to survive' (cf. *superstes*) when something else has fallen. I take this to be the sense at *Tro* 541 *quae tenera caeso virga de trunco stetit*, where the editio Lemairiana rightly comments "sola arbori superstes." That line perhaps influenced the image of Niobe at *HO* 1849–50 *ut toto stetit/succisa fetu*. Similarly at *Thy* 723 *educto stetit/ferro cadaver* and Papin. *Dig.* 10.2.35 *matrimonium post mortem quoque patris steterat* the verbs *stetit* and *steterat* imply that one might have expected a collapse; and Luc. 7.660–61 *stante potest mundo Romaque superstite Magnus/esse miser* uses *stante* as synonymous with *superstite*. Here, then, *stamus* may imply, "We remain standing though the city has fallen."[3] So Gronovius understands it, glossing thus: "Nos superstites sumus, at hic locus, ubi patria nostra stetit, in arvum & silvam convertetur."

HO 155

The transmitted *corpore* could be right, since lines 151–62 are concerned with Hercules' physical invulnerability. But the form *corpore* is used in this metrical position in 153 and 162. *Pectore* (L. Mueller 1894 187) has the advantage of suggesting both physique and valour. For the frequent confusion of forms of *pectus* and *corpus* see Housman on Manil. 1.416, *TLL* 4.999.63–66, *KK* on *Ag* 848.

---

[3] I.e. *stamus* need not have the meaning 'we stand firm,' which Watt 1996 254 rightly regards as impossible here.

HO 182

Cuncta is unmetrical (see *KK*) and attested only in A; it perhaps represents an adjustment to the neuter plurals of 181. The most straightforward correction is Peiper's *cunctos*. *Nec* in 183 will have an adversative sense, 'and yet . . . not, but . . . not' (OLD s.v. *neque* 5).

HO 183

For the conjecture *sexus* in place of *tellus* (EA) see *CQ* 54 (2004) 240.

HO 185

Gronovius wrongly reported E's reading as *Sipylum*. Though E's actual reading, the meaningless *si syphum*, has long been known, editors have very oddly continued to print this unattested *Sipylum*, which yields "fashion me into Sipylus, a weeping rock:"[4] this creates an awkward double accusative and calls a mountain a rock. The right reading is clearly *Sipyli*, preserved in PT (with the usual variations of spelling): "fashion me into a rock on Sipylus."

HO 246

E has *attonita fertur*, A *limphata rapitur*. Since lines 243–44 echo *Med* 382–83, Zw. regards *lymphata* here as authenticated by *Med* 386 *furoris ora signa lymphati gerens*. But the A interpolator often re-uses material from elsewhere in the tragedies: for examples in *Herc* alone see my comm. on 36f., 112, 212, 219, 799. So here he lifts *lymphata* from *Med* 386 and *rapitur* from another maenad context at *Med* 851. Zw. explains E's text as a normalization, but interpolation in E usually has some more specific and evident motive (see below on *HO* 1038).

HO 254

In support of his punctuation after *gradu* Zw. cites *Med* 738 *sonuit ecce vesano gradu*. But there the subject of *sonuit* is Medea, not the doors. Closer parallels are *Oed* 911 *postes sonant* and 995 *sonuere fores*, each followed by a separate clause describing the person entering. The traditional punctuation after *postes* therefore seems preferable.

[4] *Sipylum* cannot mean "*on* Sipylus" (Miller), nor can one translate "une roche qui pleure *comme* Sipyle" with Herrmann.

HO 270

Some editors follow Gronovius in choosing E's *timuit*; those who rightly prefer A's *timeat* include Leo, despite his usual inclination to E. Gronovius' only argument was to cite passages where *timuit* vel sim. is used of Hercules' reaction to the beasts he faced in the Labours.[5] But there would be little point here in Deianira claiming to *equal* the beasts that Hercules has already faced and overcome. She hopes for *worse* beasts, such as *can* defeat Hercules (257–62); if such cannot be found, she herself possesses their ferocity, and wants only their shape (263–68); she is *worse* than the hydra (284–85), not merely equal to it. In view of this line of thought, the relative clauses with subjunctive at 258 and 262 strongly commend the same construction here. E's *timuit* perhaps arose from failure to grasp the point, and/or recollection of passages where *timuit* is used as noted above. The *HO* author, however, is not just borrowing that usage, but adapting it to the present context. *Omnes* contrasts with 267–68: beasts that Hercules might fear are *all* to be found in Deianira's heart, not in faraway places.

HO 271

For the explanation of the line and its transposition after 274 see *CQ* 54 (2004) 240–41.

HO 274

The transmitted *peperi* is entirely in Senecan style, whereas the conjecture of recc. *reperi* (imperative) introduces a verb found nowhere in STrag or ps-Sen. STrag uses the perfect active of *pario* seven times, often with rhetorical point; the specific precedent for this absolute use, "I have given birth," is *Med* 26. The rhetorical implication, however, is drawn from another point in the *Medea* prologue, 50 *maiora iam me scelera post partus decent*: here as there the speaker implies that after giving birth she is mature and tough and capable of crime, not a green girl.[6] That implication fits with Deianira's insis-

---

[5] *Herc* 45, *HO* 292, *Apocol.* 5.3; add *Herc* 454, 793.

[6] Birthing is reckoned a greater ordeal than battle in famous lines of Eur. *Med.* (248–51), Latinised at Enn. *scaen.* 263.

Friedrich 1954 60 rightly retains *peperi*, but supplies *nefas* as its object from 273 *quod iubes fieri nefas?* The sense will now be, "I have already birthed any *nefas* you want to occur," and the implication will be, "I am not only prepared to commit

tence throughout 264–75 that she is an adequate instrument of Juno's revenge. The *HO* author feels able to make the point so succinctly because he can draw on the implications of the passages in *Medea*.

HO 280

For a singular verb (*feret* E) with two singular subjects cf. e.g. 47, 236, 320, 461; an example with *pariter* is 104f. *cui pariter dies/et fortuna fuit*.

HO 309

E has *tacitae*, A *sanctae*. Zw. justifies his choice of the latter simply by citing *Tro* 698 *coniugis sanctae torus* and *Ag* 239ff. *amor iugalis vincit ac flectit retro . . ., sed nunc casta repetatur fides*. But the context is quite different: in those places the issue is the *wife's* chastity; here it is whether she will tactfully overlook her *husband's* infidelities. For *tacere* connoting discretion cf. e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 4.2 *multa tacui, multa pertuli*, *Clu.* 17 *facile intellego . . . reticere homines parentum iniurias . . . oportere*, Ov. *Trist.* 2.440 *non potuit Veneris furta tacere suae*. The meaning of *tacitae* here is elucidated by the fact that *tacita fides* is a set phrase for the keeping of secrets, 477, 480, *Oed* 799, *Thy* 317.

HO 318

For the conjecture *Argea in istos terra* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 241.

HO 368

The line is stylish in A's text *nullamque amoris retinet Herculei notam*; E's unmetrical *Herculis* for *Herculei* is easily understood as simplification of the adjective to the genitive of the noun.[7] Leo's rejection of A's text reflects his assumption that E even in error is closer to the truth than A; his rewriting *nullamque amoris Hercules retinet notam* is flat, and his discussion extravagantly postulates three stages of corruption, first the inversion of *Hercules retinet*, next alteration of *Hercules* to *Herculis*, and then stylistic improvement of *Herculis* to *Herculei* in A. To the

it, but have it at hand" ("ich gehe nicht nur damit schwanger, sondern bin schon weiter damit," Friedrich). This interpretation gives a less sharp sense to *peperi* than mine, but is not necessarily wrong on that account.

[7] Cf. e.g. *Thy* 641where CS have *Pelopis* for *Pelopiae*, and *HO* 1235 where E has *Nemeae* for *Nemeaei*.

line as transmitted Leo 1.3 objects "at Telephi matrem nullam amoris Herculei notam retinere audacter dictum est." But this is inadvertence, not boldness; the hapless author meant to say that Auge retains no *vestige* of Hercules' love.

HO 370

Though several examples exist of *ardere in* + ablative (*KK*), it seems preferable to retain this example of *in* + accusative with most editors, rather than standardising to *in illis* with N. Heinsius. *TLL* 2.486.80ff. justifiably compares Stat. *Ach.* 1.473–74 *omnis in absentem belli manus ardet Achillem,/nomen Achillis amant*, though there the erotic language is used in a transferred sense.

HO 373

Neither E's *colum* nor A's *unum* makes sense here. E's *colum* surely represents the intrusion into this line of an attempt to correct or clarify the poetic plural *colos* in 372; for pedantic 'correction' of stylish plurals to singulars see below on 1038. Since A's *unum* occupies the same location as *colum*, it may originate from the same corrective or explanatory gloss: "*one* distaff!"[8] In that case we may have little guidance as to the original reading, except that *feroci* perhaps points to an antithesis such as is given by Birt's *tenerum*.

But a gloss may displace a similar-looking word, as at 1226 *costas* (glossing 1225 *latus*) displaces *totas* in E. One possible emendation for *unum* on this basis would be *vivum* in the sense 'raw, natural' (v. *OLD* s.v. 4, and the similar usage at 411 below): the *stamen* as it comes off the distaff is still loose and recognisably fleece, not yarn. *Vivus* in this sense would be a variation of the standard *rudis* (*OLD* s.v. 1), used in the context of Hercules' spinning at Ov. *AA* 2.219f. *inter Ioniacas calathum tenuisse puellas/creditur, et lanas excoluisse rudes*. Slightly less close paleographically is Watt's *niveum* (1989 341), a standard epithet of wool. W. Canter's *udum*, which held the field for centuries, was discarded by Zw. 1970 267–68 on the good grounds that there is no evidence from antiquity for damping the *stamen*.[9]

[8] Similarly the EA reading *caput* at *Oed* 184 is rightly regarded as a gloss on 185 *corporis arcem* which has intruded into an adjacent line. At *HO* 1225 *costas*, which glosses *latus*, displaces *pestis* in A (becoming *costis*), but displaces *totas* directly below in 1226 in E. (Here Zw.'s purely paleographical explanations strain credulity.)

[9] *Udum* was re-adopted by Zw. in the 1991 printing of the OCT on the weaker grounds that *una* is corrupted to *uda* at Sil. 7.659.

HO 380

Altus can convey the intensity of e.g. darkness, heat and cold, sounds, peace (*Thy* 575 al.), sleep, emotions (see *OLD* s.v. 9–10 and 13–15); the transmitted phrase *alta . . . forma* here represents an extension of that use, coloured by the fact that the woods themselves are *altae* in a different sense (e.g. *Phoen* 255 *alta nemora*, *Oed* 532 *altis . . . silvis*). *HO* 391 *altum . . . decus* shows that *altus* can be used of beauty; the connotations of the word there may include 'high-born' (*OLD* 11), but are not limited to that sense.

HO 383

In favour of E's *discussit* see above on *Med* 715.

HO 388–90

On the difficulties of these lines and possible solutions see *CQ* 54 (2004) 241–42.

HO 428–30

At *Ag* 193–94 we read *scelus occupandum est. pigra quem expectas diem?/Pelopia Phrygiae sceptra dum teneant nurus?* The *HO* author borrowed *scelus occupandum est* at 435, and used the *dum*-clause as a model for his *donec*-clause in 429–30. This indicates that the *donec*-clause is a rhetorically posed answer to the rhetorical question of 428, rather than part of that question. A question-mark is therefore needed at the end of 428, instead of the traditional comma.

HO 435

The second half of the line echoes *Med* 987 *perage, dum faciunt manus*. There *perage*, 'finish it,' fits the context. Does the reminiscence necessitate Peiper's *perage* here in place of the transmitted *perge*? Surely not: here the meaning required is 'continue, do not waver.' The author can modify his source, as he alters *faciunt manus* to *fervet manus*.

HO 461

If authentic, this line (absent in E) must be transposed after 462, as Bothe pointed out. But is it authentic? Everything else in 454–64 focusses closely on the theme 'changing the seemingly unchangeable.' Is it not suspicious that the one line not focussed on this theme is also a line absent from one tradition and misplaced in the other? The line is surely the work of an interpolator who thought that the

generalising line 463 should be coordinate with another generalising line, not with a specific instance such as 462. But in fact such linkage of specific and generalizing statements with *-que* or *et* is not unusual, cf. 252–53 *pallor ruborem pellit et formas dolor/errrat per omnes*, 302–03, 414–15, 737–38, 980–1, 1390–92, 1927–29 *anguesque suos hydra sub undas/territa mersit/teque labores, o nate, timent?*[10]

HO 465–67

Up to the mid-nineteenth century, editions read *Quas Pontus herbas generat aut quas Thessala/sub rupe Pindus, aut ubi inveniam malum/cui cedat ille?* Here *aut ubi* is A's reading. Rejection of it by Peiper, Leo and Rossbach 1888 136–37 shows the excessive devotion of their time to E, which has the unmetrical *aluit ubi*. In fact *aut ubi* is perfectly satisfactory: for *aut* introducing a different interrogative word from that used previously cf. e.g. 1772, 1798, and for *aut ubi* specifically cf. *Thy* 221; for *aut qui/quis* (465) introducing a second subject (here *Pindus*) in a question cf. e.g. *Tro* 558, 1105, *Pha* 715. Admittedly the question from *Quas* to *Pindus* is elliptical, but the ellipse <*quibus cedat ille*> is easily supplied from 476[a]:[11] after all, *aut ubi inveniam malum* just asks the same question in a more general way.

The text proposed by Rossbach and later by Axelson *Korr.* 109–10, and printed by Zw., is as follows; *Quas Pontus herbas generat aut quas Thessala/sub rupe Pindus aluit inveniam malum/cui cedat ille?* Apparently this aims to mean, "Shall I find the herbs which Pontus produces . . . [to be] a bane sufficient to overcome him?" But it is terribly forced: the predicative use of *malum* is awkward, while *Quas* in this context and position is clearly interrogative, and *inveniam* equally clearly means 'discover.'[12] E's *aluit* perhaps came from *Med* 723 in a similar context of potent herbs.

HO 472

On correction of *non* to *nil* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 242.

[10] Either the line is by the A interpolator, or it was awkwardly inserted in the margin of the archetype, leading to omission in one hyparchetype and displacement in the other.

[11] Compare e.g. the ellipse of *par* or *dignus* in the rhetorical question 402–03 *quis sub hoc mundo mihi/dabitur maritus?*

[12] Zw. 1970 270f. made the alternative suggestion of a lacuna of two half-lines between *aluit* and *aut*. The supplement he offered in *KK* was unmetrical, but did have the merit of taking *Quas* as interrogative; the substitute supplement provided at 1987[2] 384 unfortunately makes *Quas* relative once more.

HO 482–84

The immediate model is *Pha* 599–601, where Hippolytus confirms that the place is free of eavesdroppers, before Phaedra reveals her secret; *HO* 484 repeats *Pha* 601 almost verbatim. But 'ensuring the secrecy of a conversation' is also a convention of Republican drama, as Tarrant shows at 1978 248–49. The word *arbitrium* at *Pha* 601 = *HO* 484 recalls the use of *arbiter* = 'eavesdropper' in Republican drama (Tarrant ibid. fn. 15). Similarly *HO* 482 closely resembles Plaut. *Most.* 472–73 *circumspicedum, numquis est/ sermonem nostrum qui <u>aucupet</u>?* These considerations support Scaliger's conjecture *aucupet* for EA *occupet* here. *Aucupare/-i* appears four times in the fragments of Republican tragedy and six times in Plautus, and once in STrag at *Phoen* 361.

HO 488

The transmitted *ferens* is intolerably flat, as is shown by comparison with other phrases in which *Titan* is the subject of a verb governing *diem, Med* 5 *dividens, Pha* 779 *constituit, Ag* 908 *emerito die, Thy* 121 *cogat, HO* 723 *laxabat*, 1111 *excutiet*. Axelson's *premens* (*Korr.* 32 fn.) restores the *mot juste*: see *OLD* s.v. *premo* 17, "(of darkness, etc.) To cover, hide, overshadow," adding *Tro* 1142 cited by Axelson.[13]

HO 510

In 1752 E has *ast illi* but A *at illi*; the former is proved right by metre and the echo of *Herc* 1006 and *Thy* 721. At line-opening *ast ille* is offered by one of the two transmissions here and in 1736 (respectively A and E), but *at ille* by the other; it seems likely that the rarer form is right in these places as in 1752. The line-opening *at ille/-a* is transmitted by EA six times in STrag, and in *HO* at 70, 808, 1642. Consequently Leo judged *ast ille* in *HO* 510 and 1736 to be unnecessary (viz. metrically) and therefore wrong (1.216).[14] But

[13] Axelson objects to the elision created by Richter's conjecture *cum auferens*. The objection is justified but misstated. The elision would occur at the beginning of the third foot, where there are only two instances in the whole corpus of an elided monosyllable, neither resembling *c(um) auferens: Proleg.* 214–16. Axelson should not have compared this with the elision created by the E reading *te aliger* at 543, which would occur in the *middle* of the third foot. The latter elision does have parallels in STrag (*Tro* 1061, *Phoen* 290, *Ag* 794: *Proleg.* 216–18), but E's reading is open to non-metrical objections noted at *Korr.* 17.

[14] Leo thought that *ast* is often transmitted incorrectly, particularly where it

the author may have written *ast ille* at these places out of preference rather than necessity, whether for variety's sake, or to avoid an opening iamb,[15] or in reminiscence of the line-opening *ast ill-* found three times in Vergil.

HO 543

Axelson *Korr.* 100 notes the influence of *Pha* 186–94, a passage detailing the influence of Amor on earth and heaven, including Jupiter, Gradivus and other gods. Hence he persuasively emends *matri . . . saevae* to *Marti . . . saevo*. In the *Pha* passage "all the gods named are associated with fire or carry weapons and so might be expected to withstand love's attack" (Mayer ad loc.). The *HO* author exploits that point by juxtaposing *teliger puer* with *Marti saevo*.

On E's erroneous *te aliger* see above on 488 fn.

HO 564

Axelson *Korr.* 110 fn. finds no parallel for feminine *texta* (sc. *vestis*) in place of the usual neuter *textum*, but nonetheless considers the unique usage correct. The line echoes Ov. *Her.* 1 (Penelope) *nec mihi querenti spatiosam fallere noctem/lassaret viduas pendula tela manus*. That supports the conjecture of recc. *tela* for *texta* here; *texta* could have originated as a clarification, explaining that *tela* has the unusual sense of a *finished* piece of weaving. But since *texta* could conceivably be right, I retain it. Substantival *text-* (admittedly in the usual neuter form) is used in this context at Ov. *Her.* 9 (Deianira) 163 *inlita Nesseo misi tibi texta veneno*.

HO 576

A's word-order gives a more stylish line than E's, and rightly foregrounds the action rather than the person.

HO 591

Oddly both the Lemairiana and Zw. seem to assent in their discussions to Bothe's advocacy of N. Heinsius' *ponte*, yet print the transmitted

---

appears before a word beginning with a consonant (1.214), but the latter view is not now held (*OLD* s.v. *ast*).

[15] Of 100 trimeters from *HO* 450 to 550 excluding 510, only ten have iambic first feet.

fonte. In fact *fonte* is right. Rivers in spate can be said to open wide their springs (Ov. *Met*. 1.281 *fontibus ora relaxant*) or burst from their springs (V. *Georg*. 3.428 *amnes . . . rumpuntur fontibus*, Grat. 432 *ruptique ambustis faucibus amnes*); a spring itself can be said to burst forth (Caes. *Gal*. 8.41.1 *magnus fons aquae prorumpebat*). From here it is not far to speaking of 'bursting springs.'

HO 640–57

Zw.'s radical re-ordering of these lines, explained in *KK* 368–72, is open to the following objections.

1. Its chief motive is to impose a logical, top-down order in which the contrast in *securitas* between rich and poor is first stated in general terms (648–51), then illustrated in the areas of food, drink and sleep. But this is not the only way material can be ordered. If the lines are read in the transmitted order, the generalising exclamations of 648–50 arise naturally out of the details of sleepless nights in 646–47. Compare *Thy* 446–53, one of the sources of these lines, where the specific detail *numquam pavere destiti atque ipsum mei/ferrum timere lateris* gives rise to the generalising exclamation *o quantum bonum est/obstare nulli!* Similar instances include *Pha* 911, 918, *Ag* 169, *HO* 1803.
2. In the transmitted order, the details of 644–45 may seem abrupt after the generalisations of 640–43. But in moralising contexts details often appear without specific preparation because their import is clear. Since 'sleeping soundly on the ground' is a familar detail of the simple life (Hor. *Epod*. 2.23–28, Sen. *Pha* 510–514, *Ep*. 90.41), its connotation of freedom from the anxieties of the powerful would quickly be evident here. In the transmitted order, in fact, lines 644–47 hold the themes of power and wealth together (with *purpura* connoting both), whereas there is a jerky shift to wealth at 648 in Zw.'s text.
3. *KK* 371 claims that *Pha* 515ff. supports the order food-drink-sleep. But in fact 'sleep on the *caespes*' appears at *Pha* 511–14 *preceding* food and drink, with sleep reappearing at 520: consequently the *Pha* passage gives at least as much support to the transmitted line-order as to Zw.'s transpositions.
4. Zw.'s transposition of 655–56 after 652 is correct in itself: the lines' omission by A may indicate that they had already suffered some displacement in the archetype. One reason rightly given by

KK 371 for moving 655–56 after 652, rather than 657 after 654 with Axelson *Korr.* 112–13, is to preserve "den sentenzhaften Abschluß in Gestalt des Verses 657." Exactly that consideration, however, indicates that 657 should be left ending the section, not followed by 644–47.

5. Zw.'s text implies an extraordinarily complicated history of line-displacement in this passage. His hypothesis of lines being written in double columns (*KK* 370) is highly doubtful as an explanation, as I showed at *CP* 84 (1989) 237 fn. 5. Even if tenable it would account only for lines 648–57, leaving separate mechanisms to be invoked for the displacements of 643, 655–56 and 673–74.
6. Lines 673–74 do not fit where transmitted, and *KK* 368 is right that they cannot be transposed elsewhere than after 640–43. But I doubt Zw.'s claim that the lines, so transposed, introduce a *pauper/felix* contrast which then, modified into *pauper/dites*, governs much of the rest of the ode (*KK* 369). On the contrary, lines 673–74 interfere with what follows, for their *pauper* feels *invidia*, whereas the *pauper* of 644–57 enjoys peace of mind. And the fourfold repetition of *felix* in five lines is ponderous. I take 673–74 to be an instance of collaborative interpolation, based on passages such as *Tro* 1019–22.
7. Though 643 recapitulates 640, it does so more stylishly after a short diversion (641–42) than if transposed immediately after 640 with Zw.

HO 680

For correction of E *petens* to *petit* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 242.

HO 727

For correction of *Phoebi* (EA) to *Phoebo*, and for the sense of *comam*, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 242–43.

HO 739

In the first of these two fragments of lines, *tacita* is very probably ablative for metrical reasons,[16] in agreement with some such word

[16] Of 100 lines from 700 to 800 excluding 739, only seven have clearly iambic third feet.

as *peste*, now lost: cf. *Med* 832 *tacitum . . . malum*, *Pha* 362 *torretur aestu tacito*, *HO* 536 *virus . . . tacitum*. The second fragment, *quassat caput*, echoes *Oed* 911–14, similarly an entrance-announcement for a sorrowful messenger: *Sed quid hoc? postes sonant,/maestus et famulus manu/regius quassat caput. Ede quid portes novi* (echoed again in 741 *Prome quid portes novi*). My supplement <*Quis iste maestum lugubris*> *quassat caput* is based also on another sad messenger's entry, *Pha* 989 *rigatque maestis lugubrem vultum genis*. *Quis iste* in an entrance-announcement comes from *Ag* 913; Zw.'s *quisnam ille* (from *Oed* 202) would do as well.

***HO* 746**

For the conjecture <u>*spolium*</u> *triumphi* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 243.

***HO* 814**

A has *perimit*, which is then repeated in 815; E has *vicit*, which gives variation. See *KK* on 1516f. and 1521ff., where Zw. points out that in such deliberately echoing pairs of lines the A interpolator likes to increase the parallelism, writing *cantibus* at *Herc* 590 to chime with *viribus* 591, *vicit* at *HO* 1516 to match *vicit* 1517, *patiuntur* at *HO* 1523 to match *patiuntur* 1524, and *perimit* here to match 815.

***HO* 841**

Should we follow A in giving this line to Hyllus, indicating that Hercules is close to death (and so indirectly answering Deianira's questions of 772–74)? Or is E right in giving the line to Deianira as a description of her own psychosomatic reaction to the news? A's attribution is virtually guaranteed by the similar ending of Hyllus' narrative at Soph. *Trach.* 805f. καί νιν αὐτίκα/ἢ ζῶντ' ἐσόψεσθ' ἢ τεθνηκότ' ἀρτίως.[17]

***HO* 844**

Zw. persuasively recognises a lacuna before or after the phrase *reddendus orbi est*. The phrase's elliptical syntax is not itself diagnostic, since unannounced change of subject is common in *HO* as in STrag, particularly where the new subject is Hercules, cf. 299, 340, 348,

[17] Cited by Bothe ad loc. Bothe's other argument against E, that people do not speak while fainting, is shown to be overliteral by *Tro* 623 *reliquit animus membra, quatiuntur, labant* (self-description by Andromache).

353, 511, 572, 786, 812, 823 etc. Stronger is Zw.'s point that, since Hercules' relationship to Jupiter and Juno is specified (son and rival respectively, 843), his relationship to the people of the world also needs to be specified. That these are three parallel agencies is confirmed by the careful design of the rest of the speech, which interweaves the possibility of self-punishment (845–47[a], 855[a]–70) with the possibility of punishment by each of these entities, viz. Jupiter (847[b]–55[a]), the world (871–79), or Juno (880–84). *Aemuli* viz-a-viz Juno at the end of the speech overtly echoes the same usage at the beginning (883, 843); the word appears nowhere else in STrag or ps-Sen. An indication of Hercules' relationship to the world is therefore necessary at the outset, since otherwise *reddendus orbi est* looks like a weak pendant to 843.

Zw.'s supplement *vindex severus et patronus gentium* is less persuasive, since *severus* (from *Pha* 1210 *vindex severus*) is too pejorative for the context, and the metrical pattern of *patronus gentium* (final cretic with an initial consonant preceded by a word longer than a monosyllable) is unparallelled in *HO* and rare in STrag (Strzelecki 17–18). As a stopgap I suggest *ille urbium defensor et victor mali.*

HO 854

A has *erepto Hercule*; E has *sola Herculem*, which does not fit the sense. However, A making sense is sometimes further from the truth, because of interpolation, than E making nonsense. Accordingly Heinsius conjectured *in solo Hercule*: Deianira has destroyed the *equivalent* of whole nations in destroying Hercules alone. In support Heinsius cited 1840 *quot misera in uno condidi natos parens* and 1851 *gregibus aequari meus/quot ille poterat*. But the conjecture is weaker than the parallels. To call the Hercules the equal of many sons (1840) has some point—even the equal of many broods of children like Niobe's (1851), since Niobe herself used to make invidious comparisons. But to call Hercules the equal of nations is just pointless hyperbole (though as such not inconceivable in *HO*). Rather *populos* points to the theme, common in *HO*, of Hercules as *protector* of nations (e.g. 63, 873, 1018, 1334, 1541, 1605, 1810, 1816, 1868, 1901, 1997). The sense required, then, is that Deianira has *metaphorically* ruined nations (as Phaethon did literally, Ov. *Met.* 2.215) by removing their champion. Just that sense is given by A's *erepto Hercule*. The dangers to which she has exposed the nations are listed below at 873–79, where *vindicem vestrum abstuli* and *rapto vindice* support *erepto Hercule* here.

Zw. 1969[2] 767 rejects the A reading on the methodological grounds that it offers no explanation of the corruption in E, though he concedes that such explanations cannot always be given. As an example of E corruption which *cannot* be explained he cites *Ag* 746, where E has the impossible *connectens vinculo gravi* in place of the universally accepted A reading *et saucios vinclo gravi*. However, the allusiveness of that passage surely points to the origin of E's *connectens*: it has intruded from an explanatory gloss about Achilles 'fastening' Hector's hands to each other, and to the chariot, with the *vinculum* in question. Similarly here E's *sola* may have originated in a gloss bringing out the implied point that Deianira has destroyed whole nations single-handed. For intrusive glosses in E (as distinct from those in EA) cf. *Herc* 460, *Phoen* 47, *Oed* 246, *HO* 373, 847, 854, 891, 1146.

HO 861

The transmitted *poscit* enlivens the idea it conveys by a touch of personification: Mt Oeta regularly receives the sun's first rays, and hence *claims* them as its right. (On association between Oeta and dawn v. my comm. on *Herc* 133.) For *posco* with an inanimate subject cf. *Oed* 399 *te, Creo, hic poscit labor*, where *poscit* similarly suggests a rightful demand; also *Phoen* 28 (again of a place) and *HO* 846 (both *reposco*), and *OLD* s.v. *posco* 7. Schrader's conjecture *noscit* is unnecessary, and dull in comparison with *poscit*.

HO 884–982

Zw. *Rez.* 201 fn. 28 gives several arguments for believing that Deianira's interlocutor in this passage is the Nurse, as in A, not Hyllus, as in E. I would add that the vocative *Hylle* in 984 points to a new interlocutor, as it does at 1448 and 1488.

HO 885

A has *istic*, E *est hic*. *Istic* occurs in a similar context at *Herc* 1200f. *luctus est istic tuus,/crimen novercae: casus hic culpa caret*, where it is an adjective (cf. also *Oed* 1019 *fati ista culpa est*). It looks as if the A interpolator borrowed *istic* from *Herc*, failing to realise that it would need to become *istuc* (neuter) here. Since Axelson in *KK* and Zw. accept *istic*, have they similarly overlooked the need for a neuter form? Or do they intend *istic* as an adverb? If so, it has no verb to modify, since the *est* following *quodcumque* must belong with *erroris* in A's text. In E's text *est* appears twice as the sense requires, once

with *erroris*, once with *quodcumque* and *hic*: "Such iniquity as exists here is entirely due to error."

HO 899

The terminology of guilt is clear and consistent in this scene. What Deianira has done is so terrible that she calls it a *scelus* (842, 848 *scelestam*, 911, 1015). Yet she is clearly innocent in intention, and emphasises her innocence from the outset (*insontem* 748). This distinction is enunciated at 964f. *innocens animus mihi,/scelesta manus est.* That *nocens* means 'guilty by intention' is explicit in 886, and implicit in 889–90.[18] This terminology excludes the E reading *abrogat* in 899, since the line with that reading would imply that Deianira is *nocens*, i.e. guilty by intention.

In support of the E reading Gronovius, followed by others, cited a passage at the beginning of Juvenal's Satire 13, *prima est haec ultio, quod se/iudice nemo nocens absolvitur, improba quamvis/gratia fallaci praetoris vicerit urna.* But the similarity is purely verbal (*nemo nocens*) and gives no support at all to the E reading. For *poenas* in the present line, which responds to 898, must refer to *external* punishment. But Juvenal's point is exactly that a guilty person *may escape* external punishment, though he cannot escape the self-punishment of a guilty conscience (cf. *Pha* 162–64).

HO 905

E has *figens*, A *flectens*. *Flectens* is unlikely to be the work of the A interpolator, since it does not fit any of the usual categories of his interpolation. It will mean 'directing,' while *figens* will mean 'implanting' with emphasis on the success of the shots (cf. *Pha* 814, *HO* 519); the former seems more apposite to *furibunda manu*. Corruption to *figens* in E was influenced by *confixam* two lines above.

HO 907

Two aspects of responsibility are at issue in this scene. One is guilt or innocence of intention (above on 899): Deianira is innocent in

[18] The discussions at *KK* 380, *SSU* 169 fn. 30 and Walde 179–80 muddle the issue by introducing the terminology of objective and subjective guilt. The only exceptional use of (*in*)*nocens* in the scene is in 900, where it means 'guilty' without reference to intention; the word is allowed this broader sense to take up the Stichwort *nocens* in 899.

this sense, and hopes her death will establish it (890, 899, 931). The other is restitution (*reddi* 844): to spare *herself* punishment would be tantamount to forgiving her *fate*, i.e. her unintended killing of Hercules (887); such irresponsibility, or refusal to accept responsibility, would itself be culpable (888). This identification by Deianira of herself with her [actions dictated by] fate prompts the Nurse's point that Hercules, after killing Megara and his children, *ignovit . . . sibi, non furori* (E): his forgiveness was directed at himself, not at his madness—i.e. at the person whose intention was innocent, not at the unintended actions.

Carlsson 1929 53 and Zw. reject the phrase *non furori* on the ground that it weakens the argument. This reveals that they take *non furori* as meaning that Hercules' forgiveness was only partial, i.e. that he could not forgive the [actions taken in his] madness. But the above analysis shows that the issue is the direction or recipient of the forgiveness, not its completeness.

The *HO* author likes this contrastive use of *non*, cf. 763f. *prima, non sola, Herculem . . . maeres*, 901f. *error nocens,/non dextra fuerat*, 933 *fraudisque facinus esse, non nuptae*, 1209, 1373, 1645.

HO 915

Immensa pestis has caused difficulty and prompted conjecture (*immersa* recc., *immissa* N. Heinsius), since size is not a special feature of the hydra. But as the *HO* author uses *immensa* in the sense 'countless' (*OLD* s.v. 2c) at 871 and 1545, the adjective seems likely to bear that sense here, varying *numerosa pestis* 1534 (from *Herc* 241 *numerosum malum*), with reference to the creature's myriad heads.

HO 923–24

Walde 182 fn. 98 rightly sees that 923 does not express a consequence of 922, such as *proinde* 'accordingly' would suggest. Her solution is to transpose 923 and 924. Unfortunately this does not greatly improve matters; 924 is more convincing as a concluding *sententia* than as a *reason* for Deianira's decision to die. Perhaps the explanation of the illogicality lies in the author's haphazard reuse of material from Act 2 of *Phaedra*. Line 922 comes from *Pha* 265–66; *decretum* in 923 and 928 comes from *Pha* 258; 925–26 come from *Pha* 246–47; *proinde*, never common in verse (Tarrant on *Ag* 129), echoes *proin* at *Pha* 261.

HO 931

Sed saepe donum makes the familiar point that death can be a boon to the wretched (my comm. on *Herc* 511–13); *pluribus veniae fuit* then instances how death can be a boon, by bringing forgiveness.[19] The point is clearly relevant to Deianira's situation, and the thought is similar to that of 890 (except that here innocence or guilt of intention is not an issue). The point triggers the Nurse's response in 932–33: Deianira should not weakly rely on posthumous forgiveness, but 'at least' (*saltem*) make the effort to establish her innocence in her husband's eyes, i.e. while still alive.

HO 940

E's *vincet* could be an instance of the future denoting that something *will be found* to be the case: cf. Plaut. *Asin.* 734 *hic inerunt viginti minae bonae*, Ter. *Eun.* 732 *verbum hercle hoc verum erit*, Sen. *Ep.* 71.9 *sed Cn. Pompeius amittet exercitum*, 29 *tremet sapiens et dolebit et expallescet.* Then A's *vicit* is a characteristic simplification. At 676 another stylish future (this one gnomic) is reduced to a present, this time by E.

HO 949

The echo of *Pha* 1229 *umbrae nocentes, cedite*, where Theseus proposes to take over the punishments of the great sinners, shows that *laxate, manes*, belongs with what precedes (942–48), rather than with what follows as Zw. suggests.

HO 986

E has *haec*, A *hoc*; Zw. rightly prints the former, Leo the latter. *Hic* as subject is attracted to agree with the predicate (to use modern categories). This is familiar when the predicate is the only noun, cf. *Tro* 453 *haec una est salus*, "this is the only means of safety," *Phoen* 646 *est haec poena*, "this [viz. kingship] is a punishment," *Med* 547–48, *Pha* 253, *Thy* 527 (*haec* EPT recte, *hoc* CS), 1024, *HO* 1242f. A parallel for *hic* drawn from the subject noun to the predicate noun is *Oed* 104–05 *laudis hoc pretium tibi/sceptrum et peremptae Sphingis haec merces*

[19] Grotius' conjecture *venia obfuit* was an attempt to make sense of the contemporary vulgate *sed saepe donum in pluribus veniae fuit* (with no midline punctuation). But once *in* (A) is dropped and the line correctly punctuated, his conjecture is neither needed nor helpful.

datur, "This sceptre is given you as your prize of glory, your wage for dispatching the Sphinx."

HO 997–99

The seemingly pejorative allusion to Hercules' labours as "carrying out commands" in the first half of 997 misled A, and subsequently Zw., into reading it as a wish: "So may you carry out no commands" (*peragas* A). In fact the point of the phrase is to imply that Hyllus, if he refuses Deianira's current demand, will show himself incapable of carrying out orders (*perages* E) as Hercules did. (Comparison of a parent's demand to Eurystheus' commands is also made, more explicitly, at *Herc* 1315 *succumbe, virtus, perfer imperium patris./eat ad labores hic quoque Herculeos labor.*) Similarly in the second half of 997 Deianira compares herself to the monsters killed by Hercules, as she does above at 980–81. Axelson *Korr.* 10 fn. 4 convincingly explains how and why A quarried material from 1327–30 to compose line 998. Zw.'s text, based on A and accepting 998 as genuine, postulates a distinction that is implausibly complicated for such a context: "So may you carry out *no* commands, *nor* wander through the world crushing evils, but if any wild beast *is* born, may you recall your father."

HO 1001

Translators from Studley (1566) on have taken *remitto* to mean 'forgive,' and *parcent* to mean 'spare' in the sense of 'not punish.' But Zw. is right that *scelus remitto* means "I release you from the crime," and that the Eumenides will 'spare' Hyllus' hand by punishing Deianira themselves. This interpretation fits better with 1002 *verberum crepuit sonus*, which indicates that the Furies are in a mood to punish [Deianira], not to condone [Hyllus]. It also gives a more natural sense to *remitto*, viz. 'waive, remit' something that is due but unpleasant: cf. *Tro* 964f. *hoc unum mihi/remitte funus, HO* 1667f. *nec lacrimas dolor/cuiquam remisit, OLD* s.v. 13.

HO 1005

On the choice between *flagranti* (E) and *flagrante* (A) see above on *Herc* 904.

HO 1008

The context requires a word indicating that the gates of the underworld are opened (so rightly Gronovius and Zw., *pace* Axelson *Korr.* 53): cf. *Herc* 56 *in aperto, Ag* 756 *reserate, Thy* 805 *aperto carcere Ditis*, V. *Aen.* 8.244 *reseret*, Ov. *Met.* 5.357 *retegatur*. The requisite word has been displaced by *dira*(*s*) through the influence of *dira* in 1005 and 1007, perhaps abetted by reminiscence of *Thy* 16 *carceris diri*. Of Gronovius' two suggestions (*apertas* and *laxas*) *apertas* is the stronger contender; *laxus* in STrag means 'loose.'[20]

HO 1038

A has *fugas*, E *fugam*: E is no doubt 'correcting' a stylish plural, as at *Herc* 1284. For E's literal-minded 'correction' of number see my comm. on *Herc* 683f., adding *Tro* 1126, *HO* 373 (see above), 555, 1547.

HO 1041–42

Placement of the Hebrus in *furthest* Thrace, while not out of keeping with geography, perhaps comes specifically from V. *Aen.* 12.331–35 *qualis apud gelidi cum flumina concitus Hebri/ sanguineus Mavors clipeo increpat . . ./ . . . gemit* <u>*ultima*</u> *pulsu/ Thraca pedum*. When Orpheus halts the tributaries of the Hebrus in western Thrace near Mt Rhodope (1032), people in furthest or eastern Thrace, near the mouth of the Hebrus, think the river has failed. I take *Getae* to be nominative plural, with *Bistones ultimi* in apposition: the Getae are proverbially remote (*Thy* 462). Admittedly Orpheus later sings *to* the Getae (1092), but this does not seem a great difficulty, particularly in *HO*. Perhaps to avoid this difficulty, Leo in his app. crit. took *Getae* as dative singular with *defecisse*; but the author would more naturally have used the plural *Getis* (as at 1092), which would have avoided the ambiguity.

HO 1079–80

For the conjecture *sic cum* <u>*blanda per*</u> *inferos* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 243–44.

[20] Zw. 1979 183 fn. 71 prefers *laxas* on paleographical grounds. As elsewhere, he diligently parallels misreading of individual letters (l/d, a/i, x/r) without explaining why such a concentration of misreadings should have occurred.

HO 1081–82

Critics agree that these lines, which describe Sisyphus' stone,[21] need to be moved to join the other underworld punishments (1068–78). They fit better after 1071 (Peiper) than after 1078 (Richter, Axelson, Zw.) for several reasons. First, since they describe the effect of Orpheus' song on the means of punishment, not the person punished, they are more appropriately linked with 1068–71 (effect on the stone, liver and vultures) than with 1075–78 (effect on Tantalus). Second, the positive *et* and *potuit* follow better after *increvit* than after the negative *nec adhibet*. Third, if the lines are transposed after 1078, the *tunc primum* of 1075 must apply to 1082 *et vatem potuit sequi*, contrary to sense. Finally, since 1072–74 need to be moved before 1079 (Richter, Zw.), line 1072 works better if it implies 'Charon like Tantalus' (following 1078) than if it implies 'Charon like the stone' (following 1082).

HO 1092–99

For the reading *digerens* (A) in 1094, and for the conjecture *quod natum est <u>iterum</u> mori* in 1099, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 244–45.

HO 1124–25

Correction of *nefas fatum* to *nefas fati* by recc. was vindicated by Gronovius from *Cons. Pol.* 1.2. But what of the corrupt *superis*? Gronovius' *superi* (vocative) produces an inapposite appeal in this philosophical ode where the gods are as subject to fate as humans are. Leo's *superos* causes difficulties: it cannot be the object of the *capiet* of 1127, since the *tria regna* are specified in 1126; to accommodate *superos* one must therefore place a question-mark at the end of 1125, and make 1126–27 into a separate statement (Leo) or question (e.g. Herrmann), in which case *unus* stands awkwardly for *unus locus* (*KK* 392). With either *superi* or *superos*, 1124–27 merely repeats the question of 1118.

Gronovius' and Leo's conjectures have distracted attention from the old and correct solution *superus* (Ascensius).[22] I quote Schroeder's advocacy of it. "Observandum, chorum intuitu novissimae dissolu-

---

[21] *Lapis improbus* translates λᾶας ἀναιδής, which describes Sisyphus' stone at Hom. *Od.* 11.598.

[22] I owe confirmation of this attribution to Nicholas Poole-Wilson.

tionis totius universi perturbatum, distincte quaerere, quae in loca ultimo cessura sit natura rerum confusa? . . . Vides Tragicum *tartara*, & *spatium* illud *aërium*, quod dividit aethera à terris, tum *locum superum*, sive regionem coelestem, altissimam, supraque medium illud spatium elevatam, ordine attingere." I would add that this solution restores an increasing pattern, with one line for the general question 1118, two for Tartarus, three for the air, four for heaven; the last acts as a climax for the section on cataclysm, indeed for the whole ode. *Superus* appears as a plural substantive or adjective elsewhere in STrag and ps-Sen., but it is not surprising that it should appear once as a singular adjective, since it is used so once each by Vergil and Ovid, twice by Lucan and four times in Stat. *Theb*. For the not uncommon confusion of *-us* with *-is* v. *KK* 491.

HO 1166–67

1167 is omitted in E; in A *latus* has intruded from 1165, and is corrected by Gronovius to *lapis*. The content of the line so emended is decisively defended by Zw. Axelson's suggestion (*Korr*. 10) that the line was interpolated to provide a construction for a corrupt *aut* (A) at the beginning of 1168 is implausible; rather *est* was interpolated in E to make sense after 1167 had been omitted.

Billerbeck *SSU* 158 fn. 20 acutely shows that *haut* (recc.), adopted in 1166 by most editors for EA *aut*, is improbable on metrical grounds. It is also unnecessary, since *aut* is frequently used in the corpus to link a second item to a first which is negatived. For clauses so coordinated cf. *Herc* 212, *Tro* 333, *Med* 588, 593, *Pha* 490, 496, *Thy* 354, *HO* 250, 1692. For subjects so co-ordinated (here *nec lapis aut Othrys*) see above on *Thy* 139. The fact is that, after an initial negative, 'not', 'nor' and 'or' are virtually interchangeable, as is shown e.g. at *Ag* 596–603 *nullos-aut-non-non-ve-non-ve*.

HO 1181

Potuissem (A) gives an appropriate meaning, "I could have tolerated" (roughly *OLD* s.v. *possum* 3). This is parallelled in a very similar context at 1318 *perire feminae possum manu*, "I can tolerate dying at a female's hand" (viz. Juno's).

Then the following *mihi* (EA) points to an original *ei mihi* (Lipsius): for omission of *ei* cf. 1172 in A. Though *ei mihi* might seem an extravagant reaction to a past possibility (Housman *Classical Papers* 1083), the very notion of defeat by Juno would be bitter to Hercules,

who thinks about his stepmother obsessively: previously he was gleeful at having bested her (9, 31, 52, 63, 66, 75, 98), and now he begrudges her a sight of his sufferings (1134, 1277, cf. 1675).

Birt's conjecture *cadere placuisset mihi*, accepted by Axelson and Zw., makes the tail *mihi* wag the dog *potuissem*. *Placuisset* is not at all the *mot juste*, since impersonal *placet* in the tragedies regularly refers to a decision or determination originating with the person concerned (cf. *HO* 862, 888, 911, 991, 1175 and e.g. Sen. *Phoen* 118, 484, *Med* 245, 250, *Pha* 235, 568, 925, *Ag* 523, 974, *Thy* 436). Here, however, the issue is not a decision stemming from Hercules himself, but rather his acceptance of the decision of the Fates; that sense is precisely conveyed by *potuissem*.

HO 1182

The transmitted reading is *minis* (A); the easy corruption to *nimis* in E was perhaps triggered by the presence of *nimis* in 1183. Gronovius thought the idea of falling to *threats* too unheroic for Hercules, and many editors have accepted N. Heinsius' conjecture *manu*. But the Lemairiana gives the correct defence: *minae* can refer not only to threats but to an actual menacing assault. Clear examples in *HO* are 49 (n.b. *tempestas* in 50), 506, 778, 1462, 1740.

HO 1201

The hiatus at the caesura does not necessarily condemn the transmitted *o* (see below on 1402). "Hiatus before *o* is well attested in other literary genres (cf. Cat. *Carm.* 3.16; Prop. *Carm.* 2.15.1; Ov. *Met.* 14.832)" (Ferri on *Oct* 516). But it is difficult to see why the author should have tolerated the hiatus when he could so easily have written *pro* (restored by Avantius), an interjection which he liked. In addition *pro* seems more apposite here than *o*; the distinction is hard to define, but this is less of a direct address or appeal than Hippolytus' *o ferae* (*Pha* 718).

HO 1203

Reduxit has been suspected as too mild a word. But the context is not concerned so much with Cerberus' strength, as with the fact that Hercules was not returned to the underworld; for *reduco* of such a return cf. *Herc* 1338f. *redde me infernis, precor,/umbris reductum. Reduco* can, in fact, be used of a return under constraint, as in some of the examples in *OLD* s.v. 1a; add Stat. *Theb.* 6.616f. *correpto crine reduc-*

tum/occupat. (Simple *duco* likewise does not exclude constraint, e.g. *HO* 1372, 1789.) Bothe conjectured *retraxit* and Leo *revexit*, but there is no obvious reason, paleographical or other, for the supposed corruption.

HO 1213

There is no more need here of Bentley's *-ve* for *-que* than there is at *Pha* 71 (see note there).

HO 1218

Zw. rightly prefers A's *eheu quis* to E's *heu qualis*: the anaphora *quis* . . . *quis* is rhetorically better than the variation *qualis* . . . *quis*, and loss of the initial rubricated *E* on *Eheu* is highly probable. (But is *qualis* really a correction *metri causa*, as Zw. suggests? If so, it would be uncharacteristic of E: see below on 1648.)

HO 1220–21

For conjectural restoration of *aëris* in 1220 and *specus* in 1221 see *CQ* 54 (2004) 245.

HO 1225–26

For *costis* A/*costas* E as an intrusive gloss, see note and footnote above on *HO* 373.

HO 1240

The transmitted *elisit* (E elisi) is an expressive usage, which should not be replaced with Gronovius' weak *emisit*. "*Elisit* dictum videtur respectu angustiarum, per quas Gaditanum penetrat fretum:" so the Lemairiana. Carlsson 1926 69 noted two places in Curtius (8.13.9 and 9.2.17) where *elisus* is used of rivers 'squeezed' between narrowing banks. The verb is also used of liquids etc. 'forced' through openings under pressure (*OLD* s.v. 3a), e.g. Sen. *Nat.* 1.3.2 *videmus* . . . *aquam per tenue foramen elidi*. That is exactly what happened as a result of Hercules' rupture of Calpe.

Critics who reject *elisit* generally regard it as an intrusion from 1236 (or 1270). When such intrusions occur from nearby lines, the intrusive word may be quite dissimilar, at least in part, to the original.[23]

---

[23] Cf. e.g. 398 *fato* A from 394 for *voto*; 486 *locus* A from 485 for *specus*; 996 *tibi*

Consequently there is no need for such critics to sacrifice sense to form by writing *emisit* with Gronovius. By opening the Straits of Gibraltar (that is, by dividing Calpe from Abyla) Hercules let the Ocean *into* the Mediterranean basin: cf. *Herc* 238 *latam ruenti fecit Oceano viam*, where *ruenti* has the sense *irruenti*; Mela 1.27 *Herculem ipsum iunctos olim perpetuo iugo diremisse colles, atque ita exclusum antea mole montium Oceanum ad quae nunc inundat admissum*; similarly Pliny *HN* 3.4 *indigenae columnas eius dei* [sc. *Herculis*] *vocant, creduntque perfossas exclusa ante admisisse maria*. Consequently *admisit* would be the superior conjecture.

HO 1245–46

The pointed phrase *in me sepultae* looks like a characteristic borrowing by the *HO* author from STrag, in this instance from *Ag* 26f. *liberis plenus tribus/in me sepultis*. For the paradox of death in a living body cf. e.g. Cic. *Sen*. 27, Ov. *Trist*. 3.11.25–32, Sen. *Oed* 951, *Phoen* 94–98. But *in me sepultae* does not cohere with *prius*.

In the middle of 1246 there is a shift of topic from Hercules' physique to his parentage. This shift may well be triggered by a reference to Jupiter in 1245, as Bothe saw. Bothe wrote *patris* for *prius*. But vocative *pater* or *parens* is surely preferable in sense, in view of the dying Hercules' frequent invocations of Jupiter. *Parens* could just conceivably have been deformed into *prius*, but *prius* has more probably intruded from a marginal comment contrasting former with present; I would therefore prefer the more common form *pater*, which is then taken up in *patrem* 1246.

Gronovius' conjecture *vires prius/memet sepultae* is adopted by Leo and Zw. It is questionable linguistically, since forms in *-met* are not used elsewhere in *HO*, and *prius/prior* are nowhere used with an ablative of comparison in STrag or *HO*. And *prius* in this context, if correct, should refer to the former greatness of Hercules' strength, in keeping with the whole of 1235–45.

HO 1255

For correction of *est* to *es* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 245–46.

E from 993 for *times*; 1030 *verum* E from 1031 for *pergam*, 1167 *latus* A from 1165 for *lapis*, 1225 *iecur* A from 1222 for *latus*.

HO 1288

The variants *faces* E *nefas* A are discussed by Axelson *Korr.* 18f. and Watt 1989 343. Though *nefas* can be defended,[24] it seems to me that both *vincit* and *adulti* point to a reference to the sun's strength, viz. *faces*.

HO 1303

On Zw.'s unwarranted exclusion of the form *puto* see above on *Pha* 218. Here he accepts Heinsius' *imputo* in the sense 'take into account,' paraphrasing "Indem ich (dich als) den wahren Vater in Rechnung stellte." This seems a weak use of *imputare*, which normally means to put into a particular account.

HO 1322

A's reading *irata quidem* is perfectly satisfactory, and coheres well with what follows in 1323–24; for *quidem* emphasising an adjective cf. *Thy* 494f. *venit in nostras manus/tandem Thyestes, venit, et totus quidem*. Many critics have, however, thought that E's *irata pater*, though obviously erroneous, conceals the truth, while *quidem* is an interpolation. The result has been a series of unpromising conjectures, some of which Axelson lists at *Korr.* 70,[25] and to which he adds *irata satis* (from 298). Does this not take veneration for E too far? *Pater* has surely intruded from elsewhere: it occurred as a line-end as recently as 1290, 1304, 1308. For examples of words intruding from other lines see fn. above on 1240.

HO 1340

Ultimus can describe events made final by ensuing death (e.g. *dies* 306) or things 'marking the end of life' (*OLD* s.v. 6c, cf 108 *fluminis ultimi*). Just conceivably it could be transferred to Hercules' limbs (*ultima* EA) because their emaciation marks imminent death, but the

---

[24] Axelson makes subsidiary points in favour of *nefas*; the main point to be made, however, is that *nefas* can denote a violation of cosmic order, of the *foedera mundi*. So *corpora viva nefas Stygia vectare carina* (V. *Aen.* 6.391), and conversely Cerberus is a *nefas* when seen in the upper world (*Herc* 603). Destruction of the cosmos would be a *nefas Fati* (*HO* 1124). Similarly it could be called *nefas* for the sun to melt the snows of the arctic; Heraclitus fr. 94 Ἥλιος οὐχ ὑπερβήσεται μέτρα· εἰ δὲ μή, Ἐρινύες μιν Δίκης ἐπίκουροι ἐξευρήσουσιν.

[25] Add *irata precor* Peiper, *irato patre* Rossbach, *irata nimis* Kenney *CR* 1969 178. Düring's *nunc ubi irata mihi*, reported by Giardina, is repeated by Delz 1989[2] 505.

extension of sense is decidedly odd. A reference to a last embrace (*ultimum* Bothe) seems more likely: cf. Pliny *Nat.* 2.154 (*terra nos*) *semper novissime complexa gremio*, Sen. *Tro* 761 *amplexu ultimo, Med* 552, 848. For adverbial *ultimum* cf. Apul. *Met.* 2.27 *ultimum defletus atque conclamatus*. Assimilation of *ultimum* to the nearby *membra* would be very likely.

HO 1342

The readings *bracchia et amplexus* (E) and *bracchia in amplexus* (A) would involve pronunciation of the *i* of *bracchia* as *y*; on the improbability of this form of synizesis see above on *Thy* 1052. The solution is clearly Grotius' *bracchia amplexu cape*. Remarkably Zw. accepts Richter's conjecture *bracchia, amplexus cape* with its unusual asyndeton. Enumerative asyndeton is common with three or more nouns (e.g. 461, 743), or with two nouns qualified by adjectives etc. (e.g. 5–6, 882–83), but with two unqualified nouns it seems eccentric;[26] I have noticed only one example in *HO*, 1492 *patriam lares*, and that is extracted from a longer asyndetic list at *Herc* 379f.

HO 1361–62

The structure of 1361 *quae tanta nubes flamma Sicanias secat* is parallelled and supported by that of 285f. *quis ignis tantus in caelum furit/ardentis Aetnae? Tanta* must be supplied from 1361 with both *Lemnos* and *plaga* in 1362. Strict logic would require us to supply also *nubes Sicanias secat*, as Zw. points out; but sense and context immediately exclude that supplement, and show that *est* is to be understood along with *tanta*.

HO 1386

Does *toros* (E) refer to the litter on which Hercules is lying (so Gronovius), or to his muscular body (as in some translations)? Since his muscles and body are wasted by Nessus' venom (751f. *membra et Herculeos toros/urit lues*, 1224–46, 1343–35), a reference to the litter seems more apposite. For indications that Hercules lies on a litter (as in Soph. *Trach.*) cf. 1284, 1339.

---

[26] It is one of the stylistic peculiarities of *Octavia*: see below on *Oct* 261.

HO 1402

In STrag editors generally assume hiatus within the trimeter to be a sign of error: the only example with any likelihood of being authentic is *Thy* 1021, where the hiatus coincides with a speaker-change. In ps-Sen. the paradosis has three examples of hiatus: *HO* 1201, 1402, *Oct* 516.[27] Each occurs at a sense-pause at the third-foot caesura, and the present instance coincides with a speaker-change. Since hiatus is not uncommon at speaker-changes in Plautus, nor at sense-pauses e.g. in Vergil (Austin on V. *Aen.* 4.235), the examples in ps-Sen. need not be rejected ipso facto.

In the present case Avantius inserted *huc* after *agedum* to remove the hiatus. Axelson rightly questions this at *Korr.* 48 fn. on the grounds that *huc* is superfluous in sense, and that the only monosyllable used in elision at this point in the line in *HO* is *et*.[28] Axelson's own tentative suggestion of a lacuna after *agedum* could be right, but there is no obvious lacuna of meaning, and lacunae beginning in the middle of the trimeter are rare in the corpus.[29] Since *ei mihi* is a favourite interjection in *HO* (1024, 1172, 1205, 1784), it should probably not be altered here. It is conceivable, then, that the hiatus is original, particularly in view of the speaker-change.

Those who find it intolerable might consider the possibility that the familiar *ei mihi* has displaced an original *vae mihi*, perhaps after corruption of *vae*. (The author will have used *vae* instead of his usual *ei* to convey Alcmene's sense of imminent danger.) Ovid has four uses of *vae*, and a fifth in tragedy if *feror huc illuc, vae, plena deo* is correctly read in a fragment of his *Medea*.

For E's tendency to singularise poetic or expressive plurals (here *sensus*) see above on 1038.

HO 1405

For blazing eyes as indicative of madness, v. my comm. on *Herc* 1022; for *genae* = 'eyes' v. *OLD* s.v. 2.

[27] For discussion see Ferri's *Octavia* p. 273 fn.
[28] See *Proleg.* 214–16.
[29] The only examples persuasively identified so far are the pair at *HO* 718 and 739.

HO 1440

Darkness heralds the end of Hercules' illusion of entering heaven, rather as the intrusion of darkness ends his vision of universal peace at *Herc* 939ff. If we read *hinc tenebras vocat* with A, the subject of *vocat* will be a personified *Nox*; then we shall write *cubile video Noctis* with Leo, and this couch will be the place where Night sinks to rest. But in this case it makes little sense to say "from here [viz. her couch] she summons the darkness," whether she does so habitually or at present. Clearly preferable is the E reading *hinc tenebrae vocant*, "darkness calls me from here," i.e. from heaven where he supposes himself to be. This coheres well with 1441f. *quis [me] ab ipsis deducit astris*. The use of *voco* with an inanimate subject (*OLD* s.v. 2a) is common in STrag; in *HO* cf. 138, 178, 1919.

Then *cubile* probably designates the place where the *sun* spends the night (cf. Hor. *C.* 4.15.15 *solis ab Hesperio cubili*, Stat. *Theb*. 5.477, *Silv*. 3.1.183, Val. Fl. 3.37, Sil. 3.411), as Walde 212 fn. 52 believes. That may well be the sense also at Stat. *Theb*. 10.84 *super occiduae nebulosa cubilia noctis*, which is probably the source of the present phrase (*KK* 337).

HO 1452

The transmitted *clara*, if correct, refers to Megara's illustrious descent, cf. *Herc* 359f. (Lycus to Megara) *o clarum trahens/a stirpe nomen regia*, 347 *genere inclito*, 494 *nobilem*. *Cara*, conjectured by Heinsius, looks more relevant to the context, but one should not underestimate how remarkable a usage it would be for any of the emotionally challenged males of these tragedies, particularly Hercules. Of 18 uses of *carus* in STrag and *HO*, only six are by males: two are formulaic (*Tro* 227 *cara Phoebo Cilla*, *Oed* 453), one a synonym for 'related' (*Phoen* 329), one an address to a land (*Ag* 783), one painfully dutiful (*Pha* 631); only *Pha* 1247 *reliquias cari corporis* provides a real parallel. Hercules may have discovered a retrospective affection for Megara in contrast to Deianira, but he seems more likely to put stock in fame than fondness.

HO 1459

For the conjecture *caecus dolore es*, and for previous conjectures, see *CQ* 54 (2004) 246–47.

HO 1483–84

These lines are modelled on *Herc* 1285–87, where Hercules similarly envisages the means of his death: *omne Pindi Thracis excidam nemus/ Bacchique lucos et Cithaeronis iuga/mecum cremabo*. This shift from cutting woods to burning them (*excidam . . . cremabo*) supports the transmitted shift from cutting to fire in *HO*. As a pyre is not mentioned till *HO* 1484[b], there is a momentary hyperbolic suggestion that Hercules intends the forest to be burnt *in situ*, as in the *Herc* passage. Since, then, a reference to fire is authentic at the beginning of 1484, E's text *concipiat ignes* is surely correct; A's *suscipiat ignem* contains two typically wilful alterations, the second of which inadvertently introduces hiatus.

Zw., apparently unaware of the source in *Herc*, raises three objections to E's text.

1. "Mention of fire is premature, since first the pyre must be *built*." The criticism is once again too logical and schematic. Such a stage-by-stage account might be appropriate in narrative; but this is an impressionistic sketch, which turns quickly to the primary consideration in this context, viz. the means of death, fire. Even with Zw.'s conjecture (*succumbat: ingens*) there is no reference to the building of the pyre.
2. "The similarity of 1637f. shows that the verb coordinate with *caedatur* should be parallel to it in sense." This is disproved by the *Herc* passage cited above.
3. "The passage cited by Baden and Bothe to support *concipiat ignes*, Ov. *Met*. 1.254f., is not strictly parallel." Presumably Zw.'s reason is that there the heavens would catch fire (*conciperet flammas*) from the sun's heat, not from being deliberately set on fire. But first, the phrase *ignem sim. concipere* is not at all uncommon, as *OLD* shows s.v. *concipio* 1b; second, the phrase does not make a distinction between spontaneous and induced combustion, as *OLD*'s examples show; third, the vagueness of the phrase in this regard leads here to a hyperbolic suggestion of a forest fire, as noted above.

HO 1500

A has *nascente Hercule*, E *nascent Hercul* . The dative *nascenti Herculi* conjectured by Viansino and Axelson may be right, but the discussion

at *Korr.* 115 does not acknowledge the oddity of the construction. References to the prolonged night of the hero's conception often include a dative of advantage or a purposive *in* + acc.: Prop. 2.22.25 *Iuppiter Alcmenae geminas requieverat Arctos*, Ov. *Am.* 1.13.46 *commisit noctes in sua vota duas*, *Trist.* 2.402 *noctes cui coiere duae*, Sen. *Herc.* 24 *in cuius ortus mundus impendit diem*, *Ag* 814 *cui . . . noctis geminavit horas*, *HO* 1697f. *cui nocte commissa dies/quievit unus*, 1865 *cui concepto lux una perit.*[30] But these constructions modify grammatically the verb that denotes the prolongation of the night. In the present case the dative, while partially adhering to the "night," is also partially transferred to the reliability of the account (*certa est*), i.e. "whether that night is reliable for [knowledge of] Hercules' conception." The phrase conveys a meaning, but in uncouth Latin, like many a phrase in *HO*.

HO 1506

For the suggestion that *Iuppiter* has displaced *maximus* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 247.

HO 1509

E has *genuit*, A *peperit.* In STrag *genu-* is used only of fathers (3 times) and *peper-* only of mothers (7 times). But in *HO genu-* is used of mothers (492, 1679) or quasi-maternal entities such as Earth (7 times), while *peper-* appears only at 274. Here *peperit* has been interpolated to conform to the usage of STrag.

HO 1527

A has *unde non umquam remeavit ullus*, E *unde non numquam remeavit inde.* The point that no one has ever returned from the underworld, though commonplace, would be vacuous here since Hercules himself is the most famous exception. Consequently with many critics I accept Leo's *remeabit* (sc. Hercules) for *remeavit.*

At the end of the line Axelson and Zw. rightly accept Schenkl's *ille.* Watt criticises this *ille* as "intolerably otiose" (quoted by Delz 1989 60). Otiose it may be lexically, but hardly stylistically. First, it re-establishes Hercules as grammatical subject, since he last appeared in the accusative *Herculem.* Second, it carries implications ('that famous

---

[30] In view of this pattern, I suspect that the text at *Herc* 1158 originally read *cuius in fetus stetit/nox longior quam nostra*, and that the *s* was lost through haplography.

hero'), conceding that despite his heroism, and his previous successful return, he will not return this time. Compare 1610f. *esse iam flammas nihil/ostendit ille*, where *ille* similarly carries implications, though here positive ones, viz. 'in his usual all-conquering style.'

HO 1562–63

For correction of *fatis* to *factis* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 247.

HO 1566

This line designates the east, cf. Hor. *Carm. Saec.* 9f. *Sol . . . diem qui promis*, Sen. *Oed.* 121f. *promit hinc ortus aperitque lucem/Phoebus*. Lines 1565–69 list north, east and west, while the south is implicitly *excluded* at 1572–73 (for Cancer's association with the south cf. *Pha* 287, *HO* 67f.). The suggestion in Zw.'s app. crit., that a line beginning *an* and containing *ortus* has dropped out after 1566, is therefore not tenable.

HO 1595

For the supplement *mundus sonat ecce* <*vastum*> see *CQ* 54 (2004) 247–48.

HO 1621

On the sense of *minantem* here ('towering towards') v. Austin on V. *Aen.* 1.162f., 2.240.

HO 1622

The future participle *ruitura* seems to be used in a present sense. A future sense might be argued from e.g. Stat. *Theb.* 9.535f. *illam [quercum] nutantem nemus et mons ipse tremescit,/qua tellure cadat, quas obruet ordine silvas*; but *movit* should be contemporary with *tulit*. The conjecture *ruit illa* suggests itself, but it creates an awkward asyndeton with *cautem movit*, and an unfortunate double with the use of *illa* at 1626.

HO 1625

A's *nemus* is right, and E's *manus* is another instance of a word intruding from the vicinity (1618, 1635). Since *nemus* is governed by *ultra*, EA *totos* must be corrected to *totum* (Raphelengius, Bentley) to avoid excessive hyperbaton, as Ker 1962 51 pointed out. Nowhere in the corpus are the prepositions *circa citra infra intra supra ultra* separated by more than one word from the noun they govern, unless that

noun is heralded by an adjective (here *totum*), as at 45 *intraque nostras substitit metas dies*, or in one instance by a dependent genitive, 1451 *circa nivalis Caucasi domui latus*.

HO 1631

E has *omnis*, which could be nom. sing. or acc. plur.; A *omnes*. Since the oak shaded the whole grove (preceding note), there is point is saying that the whole place received sunlight after its fall. On the other hand, 'the sun's full rays' would contrast with the former darkness. (For this predicative sense of the plural *omnes* cf. *Herc* 1088, *Med* 346, *Oed* 165, *Ag* 695, *Thy* 935.) An evenly matched contest.

HO 1636

Though a meaning can be extracted from the transmitted *nemus* ("the antiquity of its woodland availed no grove"), the basic similarity in meaning of *lucus* and *nemus* makes the phrase awkward. Since *nemus* is frequent hereabouts (1625, 1632, 1641, 1642), the likelihood of its having intruded here is high. Jortin's *metus* (later proposed by Garrod 1911 212) greatly improves matters: *priscus* is more expressive when applied to human attitudes, institutions etc.

HO 1639

Tenax perhaps means tenacious of the earth, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 1195 τῆς βαθυρρίζου δρυὸς, V. *Aen.* 4.445 [*quercus*] *haeret scopulis*. But that is an odd description when the oaks have just been felled. I wonder if *flammarum* is to be supplied from *flammas* earlier in the line (cf. Col. 3.11.6 [*silex*] *tenax humoris*), particularly as *robur* often refers to oak timber rather than the living tree: pine is laid down first to catch the fire, the slow-burning oak in the next layer (n.b. *alternae trabes* 1637) to *maintain* the fire, then the shorter trunks of *ilex*, and finally Hercules' poplar on top.

HO 1648–50

In 1648 E has *arcus poposcit*, A *arcumque poscit*. Zw. considers the latter original. It cannot be co-ordinate with 1647 *fregit impositus trabes* because the content of the two clauses is too incompatible; Zw. believes that there is a lacuna before 1648 in which Hercules' arrows were mentioned.

This seems to me to undervalue E's *arcus poposcit*. Zw. rejects it as too abrupt, but such terse phrases in asyndeton, introducing a

new development, are not infrequent in narrative, e.g. *Herc* 770 *poscit Alcides viam, Ag* 535, 576 *cecidit in lucem furor, Thy* 696 *lucus tremescit*, 727 *colla percussa amputat, HO* 513, 796f., 806 *flentem videmus*. In favour of E's reading is the fact that the poetic plural *arcus* is often used when both bow and arrows are meant, cf. *Tro* 825, *Pha* 72, 203, *Ag* 864, *HO* 430, 1401, 1453. Zw.'s interpretation of E's reading as a deliberate alteration of an original *arcumque poscit*, designed to adjust the tense to the preceding perfects (after loss of material between 1647 and 1648), is improbable for two reasons. First, the E "redactor" has no grasp of metre; consequently, when he makes his rather literal-minded alterations, he does not correct metrical problems which they create (e.g. *Herc* 759, 1284, *Med* 430, *HO* 1371), and so would not have omitted *-que* here to compensate for *<po>poscit*. Second, it would be most unlike him to *introduce* the poetic plural *arcus*; on the contrary, his tendency is to normalise poetic plurals and singulars (see above on 1038). More probably, then, A's *arcumque poscit* is a rewrite of *arcus poposcit*, designed to avoid the abruptness noted above.

The fact that *has* and *his* in 1650 have no referent makes it probable, as Zw. argues, that a mention of Hercules' arrows has been lost. Zw.'s supplement is <*levibus sagittis ocius pharetras graves*>, based on *Ag* 324f. *umeroque graves/levibus telis pone pharetras* (though one might wonder if the ornate lyric style is appropriate in narrative); he places this line before 1648. This placement, however, means that *has* is separated from its supposed referent *sagittis* by four other nouns. And Zw's arguments for a lacuna before 1648 have been answered above. I therefore prefer Zw.'s alternative proposal, that a line has dropped out before 1650. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that the hydra is rarely represented as attacked by bow and arrows, as opposed to other weapons;[31] consequently the hydra looks like a makeweight here, included to pad out a tricolon whose first member is missing.

Victims of Hercules' arrows mentioned in STrag, apart from the Stymphalian birds of 1650 and Nessus who would hardly be mentioned here, are Laomedon's Troy (*Tro* 136, 824f., *Ag* 863) and Pluto at Pylos (*Herc* 560–65).[32] Troy is the better known instance, and has

---

[31] Exceptions: Apollod. 2.5.2, *LIMC* 5.1.42. For the more usual version see my comm. on *Herc.* 241f.

[32] For other victims v. Bond on Eur. *Her.* 161; according to STrag, however, Cycnus and Geryon were not shot.

a (future) connection with Philoctetes. If the line began <*has en sagittas*> (Zw., cf. *Herc* 1296), its omission will be explained by homeoarcton. I suggest, then, <*has en sagittas Dardani sensit domus*>, cf. *Tro* 871, *Ag* 223 *Dardaniae domus*, *Ag* 863f. *Dardanidae domus . . . sensit arcus*.

HO 1651

Zw. shows that *malum* (EA) cannot stand, and should be corrected to *manu* (Rossbach), with which the following *victrice* agrees. I would add that there is then an etymological play on *manu* and *eminus*. This in turn sheds light on the seeming redundancy of *manu victrice* after *vici*: shooting at a distance might seem cowardly (Eur. *Her*. 160–64 with Bond ad loc.), but Hercules registers that his *manus* had also conquered in many hand-to-hand contests. Compare *Tro* 347–48, where *comminus* both plays etymologically off *manu* and contrasts hand fighting with the archer's distant shot (*manu Paridis*).

HO 1653^{b}–55

The passage echoes *Pha* 816–19, and the odd use of a single *sive* in the sense 'or if' derives from *aut si* there. In this context, the topic of shooting birds foreshadows Philoctetes' life on Lemnos, where he will shoot birds for food (Soph. *Phil*. 287–89, Ov. *Met*. 13.53–54). If there is a mention of Troy's first fall before 1650 (see above), it similarly foreshadows Philoctetes' later life, viz. his use of the bow against Troy.

HO 1671

See Axelson *Korr*. 28–31, who concludes that despite the frequency of word repetition in this narrative (Leo 1.57), *vocibus* is probably a corruption of an original *questibus* or *luctibus* under the influence of *voce* 1672.

HO 1685

Watt 1989 345 finds *tulit* unclear, and proposes *subit* in the sense 'stole over.' Indeed *tulit* here fits none of the 39 categories of meaning assigned to *fero* by *OLD*. I would invoke the inarticulateness of *HO*, and suggest that the sense here is roughly that of *occupavit* (*OLD* s.v. *occupo* 4^{b}).

HO 1697

For the dative *cui* of Leo's conjecture, see above on 1500.

HO 1708

In defence of the transmitted phrase *ut deorum vultus ardentem Herculem/spectet* Hudson-Williams 1991 436 notes rightly that *vultus* can mean 'gaze' or 'eyes' (my comm. on *Herc* 640f.); for *vultus* in this sense as grammatical subject he compares *Herc* 595f. *tui videre vultus, HO* 1978f. *vultus putat/vidisse natum*. The oddity of the transmitted phrase, noted by Zw., lies partly in the conjunction of singular *vultus* with plural *deorum*. But *vultus* (however rendered in English) can have a collective reference (cf. *Ag* 646 *unus tota est vultus in urbe*); for its singular use with plural entities cf. *Oed* 336f. *placidone vultu sacra . . ./patiuntur, Thy* 264f. *moti Lares/vertere vultum*, Ov. *Met.* 7.133 *demisere metu vultumque animumque Pelasgi.*

HO 1716

For transposition of this line after 1712 see *CQ* 54 (2004) 248.

HO 1736

For *ast ille* (E) see above on 510.

HO 1743–44

On the combination of literal and metaphorical meaning in *ardens . . . ardentem* see Hudson-Williams 1991 437.

HO 1762

If *tumulus* (EA) is correct, A's *illi* is necessary (E *ille*): "this is his tomb." "This" can hardly be Alcmene's bosom (surely too frigid a conceit),[33] but it could be the urn, which is tomb-like in containing Hercules' mortal remains: *haec* [*urna*] *tumulus illi est* becomes *hic tumulus illi est* by gender attraction, cf. *Herc* 719f., *Tro* 453, *Phoen* 646 *regnabit. est haec poena, Med* 547, *Thy* 1024. A related point is that a great man must be satisfied with a regular-sized tomb, Juv. 10.168–72 *unus Pellaeo iuveni non sufficit orbis/ . . . sarcophago contentus erit.* Here the tomb shrinks to an urn, to emphasise the point.

Axelson's striking conjecture *hic cumulus ille est*, "he is now this mound [of ash]," is propounded in *KK*. If correct, it will play off the familiar formula "this ash is so-and-so" or "so-and-so is now

[33] Things are different if the mother is Earth, Swinburne *Ave atque Vale* "And in the hollow of her breasts a tomb."

ash," cf. Prop. 2.11.6 *cinis hic docta puella fuit*, Ov. *Met.* 12.615 [Achilles] *iam cinis est, CIL* 1.1732.3 *cinis en et tosta favilla ante obitus tristeis Helvia prima fui, TLL* 3.1073.12–17.

HO 1767

E has *solitum*, A *spolium*. The principle *lectio difficilior lectio potior* surely applies here if anywhere. D. Armstrong (*CQ* 32 [1982] 239f.) rightly defends *solitum* as an instance of rhetorical exaggeration of a single event into a habit (see Leo 1.149–51). The notion of a habit is introduced here by the imperfect *ibas* 1766: "you *used* to visit the underworld with the prospect of returning." For *soleo* of Hercules' visit there cf. 1376 *quos soles vince inferos*; for the substantival use of *solitus* cf. *Tro* 249 *solita iam et facta expeto* (referring to the single instance of Iphigenia). In view of *trahas, solitum* will refer to Cerberus (cf. *Herc* 819 *tractum canem, Pha* 844 *abstraheret canem, Ag* 859 *tractus ad caelum canis, HO* 1244 *quis mea custos manu/trahetur ultra Stygius?*), not Theseus as Armstrong interprets. For A's interpolation cf. 1235 *colla* E recte, *spolia* A, also of the Nemean Lion.

HO 1777

The pleonasm of the transmitted *me . . . Alcmenen/-am* is awkward and pointless. Bentley's *quis <u>te</u> parentem natus, <u>Alcmene</u>, suam/tantus vocabit?* is stylish, and justified by scribes' difficulties in understanding self-references which are not in the first person: compare A's interpolation of *memet* for *Phaedram* at *Pha* 1178, and my note above ad loc. Zw. is deterred from adopting Bentley's emendation by the shift from first-person *possum* 1776 to second-person *te*, which he finds "sehr hart," but such a shift is not uncommon in impassioned self-address, cf. *Phoen* 264, *Med* 51, 128, 562, 921, *Oed* 35, 77, *Thy* 179 (177 *reor*), *HO* 855.

HO 1789

The variant readings could have resulted from assimilation to the preceding *quis* (so *Ismarius* E) or the following *greges* (so *Ismarios* A). The source-passage *Herc* 1169f., however, perhaps points to qualification of the horses rather than the avenger: *procede, seu tu vindicas <u>currus truces</u>/Thracis cruenti.* For pleonasm in adjectives of place cf. 192f. *Edonas/Daulias*, 666f. *Phoebeis/Eois*, 793 *Sabaeis/Arabs*, 1474f. *Parnassio/Cirrhaea*.

HO 1792

Bentley's conjecture *exurget dolor*, made independently by Leo, seems the best emendation of the clearly corrupt *uretur dolor*. Other conjectures will be found in Giardina's app. crit.,[34] and in Billerbeck 1987 155 (*hauritur dolor*), Watt 1989 345f. (*erumpet dolor*) and Delz 1989^{2} 506 (*uret dum dolor*).[35]

HO 1794

Axelson's *qua<nta>* (*Korr.* 49f.) and Courtney's <*m*>*agna* (1985 301) both offer paleographical explanations of the corruption. Neither, however, is expressive: some such adjective as *saeva* or *dira* would better introduce *ne parere possim* and *uterum timendum*. If such an adjective became illegible in the archetype, *a qua* could have been inserted (on the basis of 1786 *a me petent supplicia*) as a plausible link betweeen *paelex supersum* and *supplicia expetet*. A's *de qua* is a later alteration designed to remove the hiatus.

HO 1831–36

This speech is attributed to Philoctetes by A; E's attribution of it to Hyllus may be ruled out.[36] Herrmann ad loc. tentatively suggested that the speech should be attributed to the Chorus, on the grounds that its sentiments resemble those of the choral anapaests 1983–88. But the Chorus there are merely seconding what *Hercules* has just said. The burden of the present speech, viz. the inappropriateness of mourning men of *virtus*, is in fact repeated by Hercules (1940–43, 1963–71), not the Chorus. In favour of Herrmann's proposal Zw.[37] notes the Chorus' role as dialogue partner at 1607–17 and 1691–92, and particularly at *Pha* 1244–46, where the Chorus have single speech urging restraint as Theseus mourns. All these instances, however, fall under the rubric of 'use of the Chorus in dialogue when no other

[34] Giardina's own suggestion *uret eam dolor* is ruled out by metre (Strzelecki 82–83).

[35] Metre virtually excludes this conjecture too: of the metrical parallels cited by Delz, the only one not shown to be a special case by Strzelecki 24 is *Phoen* 35.

[36] E does not recognise Philoctetes as a speaker in this Act, identifying the reporter of Hercules' death as a Nuntius: hence the attribution of this speech to Hyllus. If the speaker really were Hyllus, he would probably acknowledge his relationship to his grandmother in addressing her, as Alcmena does in addressing him at 1427–28.

[37] Oddly Zw. credits Andrieu with the proposal, though Andrieu attributes it to Herrmann, and does not espouse it more definitely than Herrmann.

interlocutor is available' (v. Tarrant 1978 223, my comm. on *Herc* 1032–34).

There is no difficulty about supposing Philoctetes' continued presence from earlier in the Act; in STrag speeches urging restraint of emotion are often spoken "out of the blue," even by characters whose presence was *not* previously established, e.g. Jocasta at *Oed* 81–86.

HO 1833

The transmitted *nece* is unimpeachable. One whose deathless valour has allowed death no hold on him (1834–35) "is not to be mourned nor weighed down with the heaviness of death." A similar thought occurs at 1940–43, viz. that since Hercules has attained immortality through *virtus*, Alcmene's mourning inappropriately infects him with death (*planctu iubes/sentire fatum*). Cf. also 1497f. *planctus pone funereos, precor:/. . . vivet Alcides tibi*. The contrast *nex/aeternus* probably comes from Ov. *Met.* 9.253 *aeternum est a me quod traxit, et expers/atque immune necis* (Jupiter speaking of Hercules). For *urgeo* of death see *OLD* s.v. 3[b]. Peerlkamp's *prece* for *nece* is superfluous (and unconvincing).

HO 1838

Zw. establishes the need to combine E and A readings in 1837–38[a] to produce *sedabo questus vindice amisso parens/terrae atque pelagi*. Thereafter he believes there is a lacuna in which north and south were mentioned,[38] with east and west added in 1838[b]–39. This may be right, but 'in the east and west' is sufficient in itself to connote 'throughout the world,' as in the similar passage V. *Aen.* 7.100f. *omnia sub pedibus, qua sol utrumque recurrens/aspicit Oceanum, vertique regique videbunt*; in connection with Hercules' travels cf. *Herc* 37f. with Billerbeck ad loc., 443, *HO* 315f. If there is no lacuna, *-que* is used to elaborate the topic rather than add a new topic, as at 354, 370, 483, 589, 647, 913, 944 etc.; for *-que* used in this way and coordinating substantives with a clause cf. *Herc* 606–08 *vidi inaccessa omnibus,/ignota Phoebo quaeque deterior polus/obscura diro spatia concessit Iove*.

[38] Another possibility is loss of this material after 1839, with the *quaque* of 1838 taken up by an *et qua*: cf. *Oed.* 264f. *per regna iuro quaeque nunc hospes gero/et quae reliqui*.

***HO* 1850**

The plural *greges* for Niobe's fourteen children is parallelled by its use for the seven Pleiades at *Med* 96 and the nineteen children of Hecuba at *Tro* 32. Axelson *Korr.* 116 dismisses these instances as poetic plurals and therefore not parallel; it seem likely, however, that they use *greges* to denote the plural members of a single *grex*, rather as *pecora* and *armenta* are used for the members of what could be called collectively a *pecus* or *armentum* respectively. At any rate, it is clear from *bisque septenos* that the *HO* author thought *greges* could be so used.

***HO* 1861–62**

Invidiam ut deis . . . facias is usually rendered "to arouse envy among the gods," but it is more likely to mean "to arouse rancour against the gods" (as unjust, ungrateful etc.) in view of Ov. *Met.* 4.547f. *utque parum iustae nimiumque in paelice saevae/invidiam fecere deae* (for the dative cf. *deis* here), 7.603 *quo mors foret invidiosior*, Luc. 2.36 *nullis defuit aris/invidiam factura parens*, the first and last passage in contexts of mourning.

***HO* 1885**

For the emendation *Nomiaeque* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 249.

***HO* 1907**

Zw. adopts Bentley's conjecture *dum* for EA *cum* without comment. *Dum* with a perfect indicative will mean 'for the period of time during which,' as in the only transmitted instance in the corpus, *Thy* 447f. *dum excelsus steti,/numquam pavere destiti.* This seems overprecise here. The transmitted *cum* simply indicates the occasion of Hercules' action; for *cum* so used with a past perfect of an event that was continous, but is treated as an historical fact, cf. 148, 168, 918, *Tro* 188, *Ag* 333–39, 617.

***HO* 1934**

Leo's *dira* fits the context (1931 *timent*, 1935 *feri*) better than EA *dura*. Cf. *Pha* 318 <u>minax</u> *vasti spolium leonis*.

***HO* 1952**

For correction of *et* to *an* see *CQ* 54 (2004) 249.

***HO* 1984–86**

Zw. establishes in *KK* that A's *vivite* is right against E's *vivunt*, and that *fortes* is nominative ("live courageously") not vocative ("live, brave men"). Consequently *vos* does not designate a particular group (which would require it to have a more emphatic position), but addresses all humans, as does *vivite*. As Zw. notes in *Rez*. 218f., *nec* here means 'and then, and as a result': "live courageously, and you will not descend to the underworld, but ascend to the stars."

[SENECA], *OCTAVIA*[1]

***Oct* 9**

The transmitted wording *gravior namque his* is the only example in the whole corpus of elision (as distinct from aphaeresis) in the second foot of an anapaestic metron. It should probably be retained as an instance of this author's looser handling of anapaests (see Appendix §5.2), rather than eliminated by writing *namque his gravior* with Richter 1862 4.

***Oct* 18–20**

A's *nox* makes no sense in 20, and must be corrected to *lux* (Σ). Helm 287 n. 1 wondered whether the A readings *lux* 18 and *nox* 20 should be transposed, on the grounds that Messalina was executed near or at dusk (Tac. *Ann.* 11.37). But the transposition would destroy the lines' rhetoric. First, line 18 is built on the paradox that daylight, which normally connotes life, for Octavia connotes death. Second, if *nox* is read in 18, to say immediately that light is more hateful than darkness is a *non sequitur*. Ferri ad loc. provides a full discussion, and interprets 18 correctly, in my view, as "an invocation to daylight, the day now rising."

***Oct* 26–28**

There is disagreement among the MSS and among editors about whether *ultra Oceanum* should be attached by punctuation to the preceding clause or the following one. The first possibility seems unlikely, since to say *totus orbis* and then limit it with *ultra Oceanum* produces bathos. Ferri ad loc., however, adduces passages which call Britain a second world beyond Ocean; consequently he understands *totus orbis ultra Oceanum* to refer to this second world. But it would be remarkable to find two clauses (the other being *cuique Britanni* etc.) devoted to the second world while none is devoted to the first world ruled by Claudius, viz. that of the established Empire.

[1] I am grateful to Rolando Ferri for allowing me to see proofs of his fine edition of this play while my own work was in progress.

The second possibility entails the seemingly awkward postponement of *cuique*. The author of *Oct*, however, has a penchant for postponement.[2] He postpones the form *cui* with unusual frequency, and by two words at 868 (Zw. *Prolegomena* 192); and *-que* is postponed at 363, whether by one or two words.

It is tempting to adopt Bücheler's rearrangement *cuique Britanni/ultra Oceanum terga dedere*, which produces a comparable order to Sen. *Apocol.* 12 vv. 13ff. (also anapaests about Claudius) *ille Britannos/ultra noti litora ponti/. . . dare Romuleis colla catenis/iussit.* But this tactic introduces its own difficulty. In clearly demarcated sense-units covering three metra, such as this, there is no instance in the whole corpus of internal hiatus.[3] While there are a few instances of internal *brevis in longo* in such sense-units (*SA* p. 20), it seems rash to introduce hiatus by conjecture.

An alternative, not previously proposed, would be to delete *ultra Oceanum*, regarding it as an interpolation based on the *Apocol.* passage. But since the content of lines 26–32 is recapitulated so closely in 38[b]–44, I am reluctant to remove Ocean, mentioned at 39–40, from the first passage.

Oct 48–49[a]

A's text *quem secreta refugit* in 49 is unmetrical, and Baehrens' conjecture *quem spreta refugit*, which assumes the corruption to be purely paleographical in origin, is rejected by Ferri p. 141 on solid grounds of sense and style. It seems likely, then, that *quem* is an interpolation, or part of an interpolation, by A.

If we delete *quem* with recc., can *secreta refugit* stand? Its obvious meaning, "she shuns privacy" (*secreta* neuter plural), is senseless in the context. If *secreta* were nominative feminine, it would be proleptic, "she flees into privacy," but the prolepsis is odd, and the danger of *secreta* being misunderstood as an object is great; the use of *refugio* without either an object or a prepositional phrase is also unusual, parallelled in the corpus only at *HO* 1728. This combination of oddities makes the interpretation unlikely.

---

[2] See below on 715, and Ferri pp. 32–33.

[3] This remains true despite the fact that hiatus is much more common in *Oct* than in the rest of the corpus at other points in anapaests, i.e. at the ends of consecutive dimeters (as Ferri notes ad loc.) or at the ends of three-metron sense-units.

A gambit adopted as early as Farnaby involves detaching the phrase *crudelis viri* from 48 by punctuation, and attaching it to *secreta*: "she shuns her cruel husband's private apartments."[4] But this seems improbable. First, *secreta* (if correct) surely pertains in this context to Octavia, not Nero. Second, 47^{b}–48 makes excellent sense *with crudelis viri*: "forced as she is by her husband's anger to conceal her grief, she cannot do so."[5] If *crudelis viri* is removed from this sentence, the meaning must be, "she cannot conceal her grief, constrained by her anger [against Nero]." This spoils the sense: *coactus*, particularly juxtaposed with an infinitive, conveys that one is constrained *to do* something, not that one is constrained to be unable to do it.

The fact that none of these solutions is viable leads one to conclude that the corruption in 49 goes beyond *quem*. As *secreta* should pertain in this context to Octavia, I suggest that the author wrote *secreta repetit semper*, "she always hurries back into seclusion," i.e. from public events where she is compelled to conceal her grief. This gives a close parallel to Poppaea, who seeks seclusion (*secretum petis* 691) when distraught; the parallel is telling in view of the high degree of parallellism between the Octavia-Nurse scene and the Poppaea-Nurse scene. For seeking solitude or privacy cf. e.g. *Pha* 777 *deserta petis*, Pliny *Ep*. 1.5.11 *secretum petit*, *Pan*. 48.5 *tenebras semper secretumque captantem*, Suet. *Cl*. 10.1 *secretum eo desiderante*. The verb *repeto* is altered elsewhere by the A scribe, deliberately or accidentally, at *Oed* 61 *repetat* E, *regerat* A, *Herc* 571 *repetit* E, *recipit* A, *HO* 1751. It may be that *repetit* came to him already corrupt (n.b. *Tro* 426 *repens* A *repetens* E, 1166 *secet* A *repetat* E), and that he is trying to make sense of the phrase by writing *quem . . . refugit*.

Oct 49^{b}–50

Ferri ad loc. explains why A's text cannot stand. I accept Peiper's correction *atque odio pari/ardent mariti, mutua flagrant face*. Here *mariti*

[4] Ferri p. 140 favours a meaning closer to "covert meetings with her cruel husband." But he concedes that this would have inappropriate overtones of an adulterous liaison, and would have seemed "quite as strained to a Roman reader [sic] as it is to us."

[5] *Coacta* is labelled "concessive" on this interpretation by Zw. and Ferri, too restrictively. Its relationship to *nec valet* is simply adversative: on the one hand she is constrained to hide her grief, on the other hand incapable of doing so. The fact that this conflict is not resolved syntactically reflects its insolubility for Octavia herself.

in the sense 'the married couple,' 'wife and husband,'[6] nicely points up the paradox that they are 'burning' not with love for each other, but with hatred. The A interpolator thought *mariti* must be a genitive singular ("hatred for her husband"), and therefore rewrote 50 as *ardens mariti mutua flagrat face* to make Octavia the subject. Gronovius' *ardet maritus, mutua flagrant face* does not explain the corruption so well; and the Nurse is not interested in Nero's feelings per se, but only in their effect on Octavia.

***Oct* 133**

Ferri ad loc. rightly defends A's *captat*. Carlsson 1926 52 notes that in this context the word has a suitably disdainful tone. For wordplay on unrelated words (*captat caput*) see my *Herc* comm. p. 254 with n. 74.

***Oct* 141**

Watt 1989 346 and Ferri ad loc. reject A's *genitamque fratris* as involving a substantival use of *genitus* not parallelled in pre-Christian Latin. Watt persuasively suggests that *gnatam* (Heinsius), "so spelled, is the origin of *genitam*." By echoing *nato* (139), (*g*)*natam* underlines the Nurse's point about Claudius' lack of concern for his own offspring: he demoted his own son (Britannicus) in favour of another's (Nero), and elevated another's daughter (Agrippina) while neglecting the interests of his own daughter Octavia. The common use of *genitus* as a noun in medieval Latin (Ferri) no doubt explains A's error or alteration.

Ferri prefers to write *genitamque fratre* with Gronovius. If it stood alone, this phrase could be understood substantivally, just like *sanguine alieno satum* in 140. But in proximity to *coniugem* it would inevitably be understood adjectivally, "a wife born of his brother;" this would emphasise the wrong aspect, viz. the near-incest rather than the elevation of another's child.

The fact that A's *captus* in 141[b] is unqualified is not a strong objection, since it could allow the word to suggest both *captus amore* and *mente captus*. But while *captus* would stress Claudius' helplessness, the Nurse is complaining rather of his inconsiderate perversity in preferring others' children above his own. Peiper's *pactus* fits this theme

[6] For this usage see *OLD* s.v. *maritus*[2] 1b, and compare the use of *domini* = *dominus et domina* (my comm. on *Herc* 805).

better; it is so far superior to *captus*, and the corruption is so easily explained, that I have adopted it. (*Coniugem* is now the object of both *pactus* and *iunxit; sibi* is also taken initially with *pactus*, then with *iunxit*, which gives "a more orderly appearance to the different cola" [Ferri].) The two steps, betrothal and marriage, are parallelled in Tacitus, who has the phrase *pactum inter Claudium et Agrippinam matrimonium* (*Ann.* 12.5.1); the parallel is particularly significant because *Oct* here is close to Tacitus, who similarly goes on to designate the marriage as (a) a turning-point and (b) the occasion of Silanus' suicide (*Ann.* 12.7–8). Furthermore, the phrase *pactus sibi* is pointed: a betrothal would normally involve negotiation between the prospective husband and the man who has *patria potestas* over the prospective bride, but Claudius high-handedly takes on both roles. There is a very similar point at *Tro* 59 *hic Hectoris coniugia despondet sibi*, where Fantham comments, "This Greek is arrogating the giver's role to himself, and the impropriety is reinforced by the substitution of *coniugia* "marriage" for the conventional *coniunx* in reference to Andromache." Probably there is a sardonic tone at Cic. *Fam.* 8.7.2 *Cornificius adulescens Orestillae filiam sibi despondit*, since the writer is the flippant Caelius.

Oct 156

There is no obvious justification in the context for description of the world as sacred (*orbis imperio sacri* A). Consequently Gronovius' emendation to *sacro* is attractive: *sacer* is "applied to the members or attributes of the imperial house" (*OLD* s.v. 7). But why should *sacro* following *imperio* have been corrupted to *sacri*?

Perhaps *sacri* can be explained after all. The Nurse's speech is influenced by the topos of 'the increase of crime,' for which cf. *Oct* 406–28, Cat. 64.397–406, Ov. *Met.* 1.128–50, Sen. *Pha* 540–58: e.g. the mixing of poison *Oct* 164 recalls *Met.* 1.147, and the departure of Pietas *Oct* 160 recalls *Met.* 1.149–50. The topos of crime's increase usually appears in the context of the deteriorating 'ages of humankind,' but it can be adapted to the history of one house, as happens at *Thy* 40–51 and here. The topos regularly includes the imbuing of the earth with crime (e.g. Cat. 64.397 *tellus scelerest imbuta nefando*) and/or violation of Mother Earth by ploughing and mining (n.b. *sacro sinu* at 415 below). The wording *ausa imminere est orbis imperio sacri*, then, suggests the threat of an analogous infection or violation of the world.

***Oct* 173**

A has the unmetrical *fervens flamma abstulit.* Since scribal transposition of words is not uncommon, the first solution at hand is to write *flamma fervens abstulit* with recc. But this itself involves a metrical oddity in the line-ending *fervens abstulit*, viz. a vowel-initial cretic word preceded by a spondaic word without elision. It seems unwise to introduce this oddity, unparallelled in *Oct* and rare in the rest of the corpus,[7] by conjecture: to do so would involve believing that A's unmetrical transposition occurred by coincidence at precisely the point where there was already a metrical peculiarity. The collocation of *fervens* with *flamma* is flat, since flames tend to be hot. The most likely explanation, then, is that the A interpolator is characteristically simplifying a more poetic original, e.g. *saeviens flamma* (Baehrens).

***Oct* 174**

The Nurse's speech 137–173 lacks a conclusion. She is not, after all, simply recounting family history, but trying to persuade Octavia that under present circumstances she must comply with Nero. It would be an obvious flaw of composition if the author did not follow the *narratio* with at least a brief *peroratio* addressed to Octavia; note such conclusions by Nurses urging self-restraint at *Pha* 216–17, *Ag* 221–25, *Oct* 754–55. The Nurse's speech is, in fact, largely an expansion of what she said to herself at 41ff.: her statement there about urging prudent restraint on Octavia (51–56) should be put into practice now that Octavia is her interlocutor.

In addition 174, with its vehement focus on Nero, is a non sequitur directly after 173. Nero has not at all been the focus of the Nurse's speech up to 183, being mentioned only in passing at 166 *nati*. When these indications are combined with the fact that three of the chief MSS leave a gap between 173 and 174, the likelihood of a lacuna becomes very great; otherwise one must accept a remarkable coincidence.

The fact that CS leave a space of 30 lines and P of 26 suggests

---

[7] The norm in STrag and ps.-Sen. is for a final cretic word beginning with a vowel to be preceded either by elision (e.g. *Oct* 199 *forma eminens*) or by a long monosyllable (e.g. 237 *dux impius*, 468). (Very occasionally, and in ps.-Sen. only, the long monosyllable is resolved into a double-short disyllable, *Oct* 393, *HO* 406, 757, 1847.) For this norm, and for the handful of exceptions, see Strzelecki 18–19 with footnotes.

that a full page was blank or deleted in the hyparchetype A. That the lost material actually amounted to a full page is not impossible in this very long-winded scene. But the A scribe may have left a page blank through uncertainty or misunderstanding about the length of the lacuna.[8]

Oct 195

Nempe is often used to confirm or justify what has been said: so the Nurse confirms her general point about the brief tenure of mistresses with the specific example of Acte. A close parallel is found in *HO*, where the Nurse uses *nempe* ad nauseam in adducing examples of a similar point with regard to Hercules' amours (363, 366, 369, 374): that usage surely echoes the present passage. In STrag cf. *Herc* 44, *Phoen* 522–23, *Oed* 76, *Ag* 702.

Several editors have followed Ritter in re-attributing the words *nempe praelatam sibi* from the Nurse to Octavia, presumably on the grounds that *nempe* sometimes begins a new speech continuing the syntax of the preceding words (*Tro* 340, *Pha* 244, *HO* 437). But those examples occur in the cut and thrust of short speeches. I know of no instance in the corpus of interruption of the thread of a longer speech (with or without *nempe*), much less of resumption of that thread as if the interruption had not occurred.[9]

The point of the Nurse's phrase *praelatam sibi* is that Poppaea is simply the next in a series of short-term mistresses; the impersonality of *praelatam*, "the one preferred," suits this implication of a series. The following analogy with Juno (201–21) also implies that Octavia will have to endure a string of mistresses. But each in turn will be displaced, while Octavia's position as wife is permanent.

Oct 232

The idea that comets are 'hostile, menacing, dangerous' (*infestam* A) is a natural extension from the idea that they are ill-omened, cf.

---

[8] Leo 1.46 explained away the evidence of the MSS with a hypothesis neatly summarised by Ferri ad loc. But it seems unsafe to base one's conclusions about the passage on such a hypothesis; given the vagaries of scribal tradition, several alternative hypotheses could be formulated.

[9] Ferri p. 181 cites many instances of interruption *para prosdokian* from Greek tragedy and Roman comedy, but all occur, naturally enough, in dialogue consisting of short speeches. There is an example of a speaker resuming his thread after interruption at *Oct* 458–59, but in antilabe.

V. Fl. 6.608 *fatales . . . cometae*, Sil. 8.637 *rubuit letale cometes*, Juv. 6.407 *instantem regi Armenio Parthoque cometen*; similarly Livy 8.9.12 *pestifero sidere*, Ov. *Trist.* 5.10.45 *grave sidus*, Petr. 2.7 *pestilenti . . . sidere*, and for *infestus* cf. Hor. *Epod.* 15.7 *nautis infestus Orion*. Heinsius' *infaustam*, adopted by Zw., is merely a trivialisation.[10]

In other respects the text *vidimus caelo iubar/ardens cometen*[11] *pandere infestam facem* is remarkably awkward. If correct, it means "We have seen in the sky a blazing radiance, a comet, diffuse its menacing torch." There are too many nouns here in the accusative singular, and the apposition of *cometen* with a defining function is clumsy: at *Herc* 6f. *Arctos . . . sublime . . . sidus* (cited in support by *KK*) the apposition *sublime sidus* merely elaborates on an already specified entity *Arctos*. *Iubar* normally denotes a diffused brightness, *fax* a specific source of light; it is therefore odd to speak of the former diffusing (*pandere*) the latter. In fact *iubar*, because of its unspecific meaning, is rarely used as the subject of a verb (in the corpus only *HO* 1289, where its reference is specified by *glaciale* and by the preceding *arctoas nives*).[12]

Passages employing *fax* and referring to diffusion of heavenly light include *Med* 793f. *sic face tristem pallida lucem/funde per auras*, *Pha* 411 (Hecate) *cuius relucet mundus alterna face*, 681 *trisulca mundus ardescit face*. These passages suggest that we should read *infesta face*, taking *cometen* as the subject of *pandere* and *iubar ardens* as its object. For the jingle *face/vice* at successive line-ends cf. 161f. *pede/face*, 469 *mihi/sibi*, 484f. *tuo/pio*, 734ff. *timor/tremor/timor*, 829f. *meo/suo*.

Oct 261

A's text *oblita nostri coniugis legum immemor* is awkward and unsatisfactory. First, though *nostri* must be a pronoun, its proximity to *coniugis* invites one to take it as an adjective. Second, it is unclear whether *coniugis* should be linked by asyndeton with *nostri* (so e.g. Herrmann), as sense suggests, or with *legum* (so e.g. Ferri), as the caesura suggests.[13] In either case the asyndeton is awkward because it occurs

---

[10] Repetition of *infestus* from 229 is not grounds for suspicion: see Ferri's note on 34, and my comm. on *Herc* 43f.

[11] *Cometen* is Zw.'s correction of the MSS' *cometem/-am*.

[12] See note on *Oed* 2 above. At *HO* 722 *iubar* is accusative, *pace* the Illinois index verborum.

[13] Asyndeton linking just two items is rare in the corpus (see above on *HO* 1342) but not uncommon in *Oct*, e.g. 484, 486, 547, 587, 611.

within another asyndeton, that linking the *oblita* phrase with the *immemor* phase. Correction of *nostri* to *iusti* by recc. produces a neat chiasmus, and keeps the focus on Messalina's bigamy per se (n.b. 260 *nupta nupsit*), rather than vis-a-vis her family: the latter aspect comes to the fore in 267–69. For *iustus* in a similar context cf. 133 *iustae maritum coniugis poscit caput.* A's interpolation was perhaps motivated by a desire to add pathos, and by reminiscence of *Herc* 1203 *oblite nostri.*

Oct 262

If correct, *illo* is the alternative form of *illuc*, found also at *Herc* 864, *Thy* 637, 711. But it entails difficulties. No location has been specified for Messalina's marriage to Silius, so that "thither" has no reference. Furthermore, as Ferri shows, the pleonasm of *illo . . . ad Stygios toros* cannot be supported by examples such as Plaut. *Amph.* 466 *illuc ad erum*, because this type of expression belongs to the wrong stylistic register, and *illo* is too far separated from *ad Stygios toros.*

I would add that the phrase *soluta crine* is inadequate for a Fury, whose hair tends to be fiery or snaky: *Herc* 87 *ignem flammeae spargant comae*, 984 *Tisiphone caput/serpentibus vallata, Med* 14 *crinem solutis squalidae serpentibus, HO* 1003 *torquens angue vibrato comam.* The plain *soluta crine*, coming first in this description, would suggest a woman in mourning (cf. *Herc* 202 *maesta venit crine soluto, Tro* 84 *solvite crinem*, 99, *HO* 1546, 1757, *Oct* 719 *resolutis comis*, 745 *fusae comae*), not a Fury. It may be, then, that *illo* has displaced a word ending in *-o* characterising the Fury's hair. Since snakes appear later in the line, 'fiery' is a good candidate. *Igneo* could perhaps stand by synizesis, but the A interpolator hardly knows enough about metre to recognise this as an oddity and replace it. Perhaps, then, *usto*, "scorched," indicating the effect of the habitual fire, just as at *Med* 829 *habeo flammas/<u>usto</u> tauri gutture raptas.* This offers an explanation of the error, viz. mechanical corruption to *isto* (cf. *Tro* 585 *ustis* A *istis* E) followed by 'correction' to *illo.*

More conservative conjectures have not been successful. Heinsius proposed *illi* (dative), but Zw. in *KK* finds no example in the corpus of *venire* with dative, much less of *venire* with both dative and a prepositional phrase indicating the place reached.[14] Zw. himself offers *illos*,

[14] Ferri ad loc. claims that this combination is "a recurrent stylistic construction"

but Ferri ad loc. demonstrates exhaustively that this is too far separated from its referent *toros*.

Oct 289

Correction of the paradosis to *aevo suadente metu<m>* (Wilamowitz) is so straightforward that it seems unnecessary to consider alternatives. For ablative absolutes governing objects cf. e.g. *Pha* 306 *ungula lentos imitante remos*, 322, *Oct* 396 *tenente regna Saturno*, 509 *tabula notante deditos*.

Does *aevo* mean 'the present age' or 'old age'? The former gives a good contrast with *priorum virtus* 291, the courage of former ages. In a Senecan context old age is actually likely to inspire courage or willingness to die rather than cowardice, cf. *Pha* 139 *fortem facit vicina libertas senem*, *Tro* 1169, *Phoen* 32, *Ep.* 104.2–4.

Oct 294–308

Zw. follows Baehrens' complicated transposition of 300 after 303 and 296–99 after 300, the purpose of which is to restore the chronological order Lucretia-Verginia. But the inversion of chronology in the transmitted text has an obvious rhetorical function, viz. that Tarquin's wife Tullia (304–08) provides a transition from the theme of despotism, via parricide by despots, to matricide by the current despot Nero (309f.). For inversion of chronology for rhetorical purpose cf. *Thy* 42–44, where Agamemnon's peril from Clytemnestra precedes the Trojan War, as crimes within the house are listed before crimes abroad. The reference to war in line 300 introduces the case of Lucretia, as in the transmitted order, much better than that of Verginia: Horatius had to hold the bridge against Tarquin's army, but the unrest following Verginia's death did not lead to civil war (Livy 3.44–48).

Chronological order is in fact established through the initial reference to the expulsion of the kings (294f.). The following line, *ultique tuos sunt bene manes*, has more point if it refers to a separate episode (Verginia) rather than the same episode. This sequence throws light on the transmitted pluperfect *expulerant* in 294. Many editors follow recc. in emending to *expulerunt* to match the perfect *ulti sunt*, using

---

in Augustan poetry, but several of his examples are invalid: Tib. 1.3.65 has no prepositional phrase; at Ov. *Pont.* 4.6.1 *ex* is not the same as *ad* or *in*; at Ov. *Her.* 21.157 *mihi* belongs not with *veniens* but *positas* (so Goold's Loeb translation); at Prop. 1.14.11 *mihi* is possessive with *tecta*.

the scansion - *runt* found in Plautus and occasionally in dactylic verse (see Austin on V. *Aen.* 2.774). But this would be the only instance of such scansion in the Senecan corpus, so that one hesitates to introduce it by conjecture. Rather the pluperfect *expulerant* marks the distance in time between the expulsion of the kings and the episode of Verginia; for use of the pluperfect when the writer has a later event in sight, see above on *Tro* 1098.

Oct 354

Quamvis has long been suspected, presumably on the grounds stated by Ferri ad loc., "Agrippina's followers do not come to her rescue *despite* her exhaustion." This seems to me over-precise: the connection of thought, admittedly slightly elliptical, is that *although* Agrippina is exhausted and almost drowning (and might therefore be given up), people encourage and support her. I take *quamvis* to govern the whole participial phrase *bracchia lenta trahentem*, as at *Thy* 304 *quamvis rigentem tot malis*. In Lipsius' conjecture *quam vix* for *quamvis*, the word *quam* is quite superfluous to the sense.

Oct 388

Gronovius' *noctis* is surely right. It was displaced in A by *solis* from immediately above in 387; the *sortis* of δ is an attempt to correct the obviously erroneous *solis*. Ferri ad loc. believes *sortis* to be right (with adjustment of *alternas* to *alternae*), but *sors* is not used of day and/or night, or of any heavenly phenomena, in STrag or ps.-Sen. Furthermore the phrase *sortis alternae vices* is remarkable woolly. Ferri commends it as providing "a welcome link" between the orbits of sun and moon. But in fact the phrase *mundique motus* provides such a link, since the movements of the *mundus* are associated with the changes of day and night, cf. *Herc* 125f. (at dawn) *iam rara micant/sidera* <u>*prono*</u> *languida* <u>*mundo*</u> ("as the heavens sink down"), *Ag* 827 *tibi concitatus substitit mundus* (during the double night of Hercules' conception).

Oct 391–92

Apart from Scaliger's widely accepted correction *qui* <u>*si*</u> *senescit* at the beginning of 391, I see no reason to question or alter the paradosis. If the heavens are aging, says 'Seneca,' with their collapse inevitable, it follows that the periodic cataclysm is now at hand (*nunc adest*). Though he phrases the sentence as a condition, the implication is that he believes the cataclysm to be imminent. The reason

for this belief emerges gradually from the following account of the ages: the human race has reached a nadir of evil, which means that its renewal is now due.[15]

Consequently Ritter's replacement of *nunc* with *tunc*, accepted by Zw. and Ferri, seems to me unnecessary. Presumably this *tunc* is meant to mark the apodosis (so Ferri). But the word can hardly fail to have some temporal sense, which would conflict with the present tenses: it would seem to require *senescet* and *tunc aderit.*

***Oct* 406–17**

The traditional view is that the description of the fourth age begins in 409, with *extitit* supplied from 408. I follow this view because the brief account of the second age is acceptable if matched by a similarly brief account of the third, and because it would be odd to have the third age divided into two sub-periods, (a) *sanctum* and (b) *inquietum*, as on Zw.'s interpretation. The fact that 408 *sanctum tamen* echoes Ov. *Met.* 1.127 *non scelerata tamen* suggests that it similarly ends the description of the third age. In addition the Relative of Characteristic construction *quod auderet* is more appropriate to a separate 'race' than to a distinct phase of the same 'race'; if a separate 'race' is meant, we supply *genus extitit* in 409, which gives a clear antecedent to *quod. Mox* in 409 means 'then, next, later,' as regularly in *Oct* (cf. 45, 166, 418, 688, 831, 938, 956).

Deterior aetas 417 designates a later and worse age[16] that indulged in mining, cf. Sen. *NQ* 1.17.6 *postquam deterior populus ipsas subit terras effossurus obruenda.* This gives five ages in all, as Herrmann notes ad loc. (The number of ages in this quasi-myth is flexible: Hesiod has five, Ovid four, Tibullus and Vergil two.)[17] But the author obscures the total by not numbering most of the ages or associating them with particular metals. The effect is to modify the schematism of 'gold/silver/bronze/iron' in the direction of a more naturalistic, evolutionary account such as is implied in Sen. *Pha* 540–57 and *Ep.* 90.

---

[15] For this combination in the cataclysm of physical process with moral purpose (periodic renewal of the human race which has grown degenerate), compare particularly *NQ* 3.29.4–5, 30.7–8.

[16] *Pace* Miller, who translates "that degenerate age."

[17] Hes. *Op.* 106–201, Ov. *Met.* 1.89–150, Tib. 1.3.35–50, V. *Georg.* 1.125–46, 2.536–40.

Oct 411–12

See the discussions of Ferri and Zw. ad loc., and Zw.'s app. crit. It seems likely that *vel* in 411 indicates alternative methods of fishing (net or rod) rather than different quarries, since infinitives in this list are linked by asyndeton (*sequi/extrahere*, *tenere/premere/sulcare*). If *extrahere* and *decipere* were linked by a copula, it should not be *vel*, since fishing and fowling are not alternatives but complementary activities in this list.

The trio 'beasts, fish, birds' comprises the whole of hunting and covers the three regions land, water, air; *premere tauros* moves to a different topic, viz. domestication, in preparation for ploughing (*sulcare* 414). The object of *tenere laqueo*, then, is not a specific kind of beast, e.g. deer, but the *volucres* of 412. So we have two alternative methods of fowling, as of fishing in 411. Indeed, the *vel* of 412 is probably right, since the most likely explanation for the scribe's error is that his eye jumped from a *vel* in 412 back to *vel calamo levi* in 411.

Cratis is a general word for wickerwork, the particular application being specified by the context (see *OLD* s.v. 1b–g). A context of fowling suggests traps into which the birds are lured. There are actually few viable alternatives to *crate* if the adjacent *vel* is right: *arte* will not do in this list of equipment.

Peiper's supplement *decipere volucres crate vel <posito vagas>/tenere laqueo* makes a nice contrast between wandering birds and fixed snares. For *posito* Siegmund substituted *tereti*, from *Pha* 45 *teretes . . . laqueos*. But that passage emphasises the physical structure of both nets (*raras . . . plagas*) and snares. Concerning fishing *Oct* makes a physical contrast between heavy nets and light poles (410f.), but concerning birds the contrast is rather between *tricking* them into a trap and *gripping* them with a snare.

Oct 415

Zw. is right that *alte condidit* cannot govern *fruges suas* for reasons of sense: it would indicate not a less generous bestowing of crops (which the context requires), but a complete withdrawal of them, as at *h. Dem.* 306f. οὐδέ τι γαῖα/σπέρμ' ἀνίει· κρύπτεν γὰρ ἐυστέφανος Δημήτηρ. The metals are a much more likely object of such 'hiding,' as the passages cited by Zw. show. True, those passages do not speak of Earth hiding the metals in response to being 'wounded.' But in the important account in Ov. *Met.* 1, the hiding of metals is mentioned just after the introduction of farming: *nec tantum segetes alimentaque debita*

dives/poscebatur humus, sed itum est in viscera terrae,/quasque recondiderat Stygiisque admoverat umbris/effodiuntur opes (137–40). The author of *Oct* could have read this—either erroneously or with deliberate innovation—to mean that Earth "had hidden" the metals recently, after farming began.

Oct 448

"In the cut and thrust of a tense argument Seneca should be deliberately completing and twisting Nero's answer." So Ferri ad loc., who persuasively interprets this *ut* clause as picking up the *satis* of 447: "enough that the gods . . ." To print this as a statement, however, seems to me to give it a heavily sarcastic tone, not matched by Sen.'s tone elsewhere in this scene. I prefer to punctuate 448 as a question, which lightens the sarcasm. Comparable *ut*-clauses in questions include 178 *ut fratrem ademptum scelere restituat mihi?*, 379, 463, *Herc* 1186 *ut inultus ego sim?*, *Phoen* 498, 586, 644, *Pha* 1214.[18]

Oct 458

Ferri 1999 634–35 argues persuasively against *metuant*. It may be an A interpolation, and was probably suggested by *timeri* above, which means that we have no paleographical clues to the original. Ferri suggests *laudent, probent, faveant* or *ament* as possibilities. *Ament* may be excluded since this Nero is not interested in the citizens' feelings (except fear), only in their compliance. Nor will *probent* do, since it would suggest some independent assessment of his deeds, which Nero will not concede even to the gods (*comprobent* 448), much less to humans (460–61). *Faveant* seems too bland for the context. *Laudent* fits well: insincere praise demonstrates the ruler's power, as Nero's prototype Atreus remarks (*Thy* 205–12, cited by Ferri).

Oct 487–90

Frassinetti's proposal (1973 1105) to invert the order of 488 and 489 has three advantages at least: *electus* is placed close to the ablatives *votis* and *iudicio* (487) which modify and explain it; the titles *pacis auctor, generis humani arbiter, patriae parens*, with their parallel structure, are

[18] The common interpretation of the *ut*-clause as a wish "yields feeble sense" (Ferri). I know of no example in the corpus of *ut* introducing a wish or prayer, a usage found especially in imprecations (*OLD* s.v. 42). *Et* (PT) looks like a simplification.

now placed together; and the proposal avoids modification of *auctor* by *electus*, which is awkward because the connotations of the two words are at variance. Contra, Ferri ad loc. argues that *electus* refers to divine election, albeit modified by 487. But this would weaken the ideological contrast, here and at 572–92, between Sen.'s advocacy of rule with the consent of the ruled, and Nero's insistence on absolutism.

In 489 *spiritu* (PT) is rightly accepted by critics on the basis of Sen. *Clem.* 1.3.5 *haec immensa multitudo . . . illius spiritu regitur*. The following *sacra*, then, must be corrupt. Gruter's emendation *sacro*, however interpreted,[19] is unsuitable to the context, which is concerned not with Nero's qualities, but with the position in which Fortune and Rome have placed him, and the responsibilities it entails. *Sacrum*, proposed by Leo 1903 311, appropriately emphasises the solemn nature of Nero's charge (cf. 156 *orbis imperio sacri*).

Oct 501

Saepe looks difficult: rhetorically the phrase *Iovi aequatus* is actually weakened if modified by *saepe*, and *per honorum gradus* might suggest an ascent to a crowning position (cf. e.g. Livy 32.7.10 *per honorum gradus . . . tendere ad consulatum*), rather than a repeated attainment of that position. But Bücheler's *ipse* for *saepe* is no improvement, as Zw. shows.

At 721 *saepe* clearly modifies a noun phrase (*tubarum sonum*): for adverbs modifying nouns v. L-H 467, K-S 1.218, and for *saepe* specifically v. Fraenkel, *Horace* p. 78 n. 1. Perhaps, then, *saepe* here modifies *honorum gradus*, and *gradus* means 'course, sequence' (not connoting escalation), as at *Herc* 291 *per annorum gradus, Pha* 452 (deus) *aevum per suos ducit gradus*. This rules out the conjecture *alto* for *altos* (Heinsius, Zw.), which would leave *saepe* no longer enclosed in the phrase *altos . . . gradus*, and therefore liable to be taken wrongly with *aequatus*. Ferri argues strongly against *alto* on the grounds that *per honorum gradus* alone, without *altos*, would connote the regular magistracies, not Caesar's exceptional honours.

---

[19] For *sacer* "applied to the members or attributes of the imperial house" v. *OLD* s.v. 7, Ferri ad 156. Ballaira and Zw. see Stoic colouring, citing Sen. *Ep.* 41.2 *sacer intra nos spiritus sedet*; but to ascribe a portion of the divine reason to Nero's spirit at this juncture would be laughable.

***Oct* 515–17**

A's *hausit* is initially attractive because it continues the 'devouring' imagery of *pavere* 515. The hiatus between *Philippi* and *hausit* is not conclusive evidence of corruption (see above on *HO* 1402). But added to it there is the possibility that *hausit* has intruded from 521: for such intrusions see above on *HO* 1240 fn. This seems unlikely to be coincidence.

Of the many conjectures,[20] I prefer Heinsius' *sorpsit* (which he spelled *sorbsit*), in part because it matches the imagery of *pavere*. An imitator of Sen. might well echo his use of *sorbere* for 'swallowing' ships, cf. *Pha* 1049 *pistrix sorbet rates, NQ* 6.32.7 *naufragiorum totas classes sorbentium, Ep.* 4.7 *eodem die ubi luserunt navigia, sorbentur,* 30.4. Given the context of the Sicilian Sea, the verb could have been suggested here by reminiscence of Charybdis, cf. Sall. *Hist.* 4.28 *Charybdis . . . illata navigia sorbens*, Sen. *Med* 409f. *Charybdis Ausonium mare/Siculumque sorbens, Cons. Marc. 17.2 Charybdin . . . navigia sorbentem.* The perfect stem *sorps-* is rare, but found at Val. Max. 8.7 ext. 2 *sorpsit* and at Luc. 4.100 *absorpsit.* The rarity of the form may explain why it was replaced with the more standard, and approximately synonymous, *hausit.*

Zw. follows Peiper in believing the hiatus to indicate a lacuna, writing "post *Philippi* aliquid de bello Perusino excidisse putaverim (cf. Sen. *clem.* 1.11.1; Suet. *Aug.* 9)" (OCT app. crit.). But the two existing clauses make a good pair, each with a place-name as the grammatical subject (*Philippi, Siculum mare*), the first designating losses by land and the second by sea;[21] the following reference to the *orbis* tends to confirm that the author is thinking in such cosmic terms.

Saepe in 517 goes chiefly with the main verb <*sorpsit*>, and so parallels *diu* modifying *pavere* in 515. If *saepe* were taken with *caedentes suos* (so *KK*), it could hardly mean "as they often killed fellow-countrymen," since they did not "often" kill *as they sank*, and in any case fellow-countrymen are killed constantly, not just often, in civil war. The phrase might mean "men who *had* often killed fellow-countrymen," in which case the present participle is used atemporally (my comm. on *Herc* 1182 *pereuntis*).

---

[20] Listed by Whitman ad loc. (but Bothe notes that his *exhausit* comes from Ascensius); add *clausit* M. Müller 1912.

[21] The phrasing *Siculum mare* <*sorpsit*> *classes* suggests that the reference is to losses not only in battle but also by storm (Suet. *Aug.* 16, App. *BC* 5.88–91).

***Oct* 522**

M. Müller's correction of *nunc* to *non* seems to me justified.[22] Ferri ad loc. defends *nunc*, suggesting that it gives a note of pathos, and comparing 169f. *nunc levis tantum cinis/et tristis umbra*. But the present passage, beginning with 503 *quantum cruoris Roma tunc vidit sui*, is concerned rather with the magnitude of Rome's losses in the civil war: in keeping with this theme is the point that a second *mighty* Roman general lies in the soil of degenerate Egypt.

***Oct* 553**

Bothe's correction of A *recedat* to *recedet* is rightly accepted by Leo, Richter and others. "Amor will forsake you" follows well on Sen.'s previous argument about (Poppaea's) beauty fading and (Octavia's) goodness enduring; its semi-personification of amor also permits the full personification of Nero's reply. For the point that love/Love will not abide in this relationship cf. 199f. *et hanc levis fallaxque destituet deus/volucer Cupido*.

If we read *recedet*, love is characterised consistently in the two clauses as a fickle, independent entity: it will decamp at some point, and therefore should not be trusted. But if we read *recedat*, "let love depart" is a (peculiar) way of saying "relinquish your love." That entails a different concept of love, as an emotion potentially under Nero's control, which clashes with the other concept of love in *temere ne credas*.

Interruptions of syntax such as *temere ne credas*, viz. those containing a parenthetic jussive, tend to occur within statements, not within other jussives:[23] *Pha* 330f. *sacer est ignis (credite laesis)/nimiumque potens*, 820 *raris forma viris (saecula perspice)/impunita fuit*, *Herc* 266f. *quae fecit et (fas sit loqui)/fortasse faciet*, *Tro* 276f. Similarly, brief negative commands tend to reinforce statements, not other commands, e.g. *Phoen* 495, 645 *ne metue: poenas et quidem solvet graves*, *Ag* 1004 *ne trahite, vestros ipsa praecedam gradus*, *Thy* 980 *satiaberis, ne metue*. Nero's answer, "love is irremovable," follows as well after *recedet* ("love will leave you") as after *recedat* ("let love leave you").

---

[22] For confusion of these two words cf. *Herc* 418 *nunc* Ω *non* P; 454 *nunc* δ *non* β; 937 *non* PS *nunc* KQ.

[23] Ferri does, however, find an example of the latter at V. *Aen.* 12. 146 *disce tuum, ne me incuses, Iuturna, dolorem*.

***Oct* 577**

Since *favor* (A) is used several times in the play of popular support for Octavia, Zw.'s revival of Avantius' *furor* is initially surprising; in fact, however, it is justified. The two words are easily confused by scribes, cf. 786, 792, *Pha* 195, 1271. *Temere conceptus* could scarcely be applied to the citizens' longstanding support for Octavia, but could well be applied to possible resistance to the new marriage: cf. 792–93 *hinc urit animos* <u>*pertinax*</u> <u>*nimium*</u> *favor/et in furorem* <u>*temere*</u> *praecipites agit.* Since in 572–82 popular feeling is presented as opposition to the new marriage more than as support for Octavia, one would expect *favor*, if correct, to be qualified by an objective genitive, as e.g. at 786 *Octaviae favore.* Finally *furor* is supported by the verbal parallels cited in Zw.'s app. crit., 783f. *victa nec cedit metu/concepta rabies temere, Herc* 363 *nec coeptus umquam cedat ex animis furor.*

***Oct* 600**

The transmitted *et* after *reddita* is unclear: does it link this participial phrase with *memoria* in 599, or is it correlative with *et* in 601 ("both . . . and")? Bücheler's emendation to *est* gives clearer syntax, and the historic tense leads into the narrative that follows in 603ff. The perfect passive *reddita est* is placed early in recounting something reprehensible, rather as at 147f. *feminae est munus datus/Silanus*, 523f. *illic sepultum est impie gestum diu/civile bellum.*

***Oct* 607**

Intra (β) is right against *inter* (δ): see below on 747.

***Oct* 611**

A's reading *simulacra titulos destruit* <u>*mortis metu*</u> could only mean that Nero destroys these things "out of fear of death." But this cannot be right. Though Nero was indeed mortally afraid immediately after the matricide according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 14.10), he soon found himself congratulated on all sides for his supposed narrow escape from assassination. And the author has already given Nero's motive for erasing Agrippina's memory as hatred (609 *odia, saevit*), not fear. The clause could not mean "he orders my statues and inscriptions destroyed on pain of death" (so *KK*).[24] *Pha* 727 *mortis intentat metum* and Tac.

[24] Zw. writes "so schon Farnabius." In fact the interpretation goes back at least

Ann. 1.39.3 *intento mortis metu* give no support to this interpretation, since they contain an explanatory word *intentat/intento* which is absent here. *Oct* 154 *et te iunxit invitam metu* is somewhat more comparable, but there both *te* and *invitam* help to clarify the meaning and reduce ambiguity. Here *mortis metu* has clearly intruded from the line-ending of 106 and/or 507 (where it does indeed mean "out of fear of death"), through whatever scribal error or caprice.

Such intrusions make it impossible to reconstruct the original with certainty. But Grotius' suggestion *memores mei* is excellent, and occurred later to Leo 1903 311–12. For *titulos memores* cf. Prop. 2.13.40 *lapides memores*, Ov. *Met.* 8.744 *memoresque tabellae*, and for the genitive in such a context cf. Hor. *C.* 3.11.51 *nostri memorem sepulcro/scalpe querellam.*

Oct 628

Is *regna* the subject of *ferant*, or an object parallel with *divitias*? For discussion with select bibliography see Kragelund 2000 508–09 and Ferri ad loc., both preferring the first option.

Oct 631

Zw. and Ferri rightly accept the transposition of A's *et* . . . *ac* to *ac* . . . *et* by recc. There is no example elsewhere in the corpus of *ac* preceding a word beginning with *c*, as in A's *ac cunctis.*

Oct 691

Leo and later editors alter A's *quodve* to *quidve* with recc., wrongly: *quidve* is found in the corpus only after a preceding *quid*. The interrogative adjective *quodve* following a *quo*-question is well supported by 899f. *quo me trahitis quodve tyrannus/aut exilium regina iubet?* and *Herc* 1012 *quo misera pergis? quam fugam aut latebram petis?*

Oct 696

A's reading *et culpa senece* is meaningless in itself, and a reference to either Sen. or some *culpa* is out of place in the mouth of this Panglossian Nurse, who is putting an entirely positive spin on the

to Trevet, who writes "id est sub pena mortis precipit ubique destrui et deleri ymagines et statuas honori meo intitulatas." Similarly Nuce's version of 1566 gives, "Who threating death to them that doe withstand,/My shapes he dingeth downe in every land."

marriage to Nero in order to counter Poppaea's evident distress, as in her next speech she interprets every bad omen as good. Birt's emendation *et culta sancte* fits the context very well, explaining why Venus favoured Poppaea, and taking up *precibus et votis* 693.

If *sancte* was abbreviated *sce* in A,[25] misinterpretation as *senece* was quite probable. Such misinterpretation would be particularly likely if the margin contained a note such as *quod culpat seneca*, i.e. a reference to Seneca's recent denunciation of the notion of Venus as a goddess, mother of Amor (557–65). That denunciation would have impressed a Christian scribe, as the similar denunciation at *Pha* 195f. was remembered and quoted by Augustine. For proper names betraying intrusive glosses cf. e.g. *Pha* 831, *Oed* 246, *Ag* 315, *Thy* 58, *HO* 891, though in these and most cases the purpose of the gloss is explanatory.

Oct 715

The description of the stars as black (*atris* A) is unlikely to be right. It might be thought comparable to the application in verse of *ater* to fires and torches; but that usage regularly connotes smokiness and/or destructiveness, and often involves association with the underworld. *Atris* here could only be defended on different grounds, viz. as transferred from the blackness of night.[26] But the application of the word to the bright stars seems too paradoxical for the relatively plain style of *Oct.*

Altis suggests itself as a replacement because of scribes' tendency to confuse *alt-* with *atr-* (cf. *Oed* 164, *Thy* 51), but that adjective would be quite inert in the present clause. It seems likely, then, that the original reading was *atrae* (sc. *nocti*), proposed by Peiper. Postponement of conjunctions and particles (here *et*) by two or more words, though rare in STrag, is by no means uncommon in *Oct.*[27] The hyperbaton of *cessit* can also be parallelled from passages where a word is supplied from the second phrase or clause into the first, e.g. 796f. (*effigies*)

[25] CS regularly write *sc-* for *sanct-* in *Oct*, and P does so except at 286 and 841 (no abbreviation).

[26] So Trevet: "non quia sydera in se sint atra hoc dicit, sed quia atro tempore noctis apparent." Ferri ad loc. compares *Pha* 1217 *donator atrae lucis*, where *atrae* connotes night, death and the underworld. But there would be no justification in the present context for so powerfully emotional a paradox.

[27] E.g. *et* at 418, 688, *aut* at 421, *neve* at 271, *nec* at 402, 608, *ut* at 370, 463: see Zw. *Proleg.* 231–33.

afflicta vulgi manibus et saevo iacet/eversa ferro, 897f. *quatiunt altas saepe procellae/aut evertit Fortuna domos*, 899f. *quodve tyrannus/aut exilium regina iubet?* For other unusual hyperbata in *Oct* cf. e.g. 362f. *furit ereptam pelagoque dolet/vivere matrem*, 958f. *me quoque tristes mittit ad umbras/ferus et manes ecce tyrannus*. The likelihood of an original *atrae* being assimilated to the adjacent *sideribus* would have been high, because of the unusual word-order.

Oct 744

The masculine *leto* (δ), i.e. *laeto*, is correct against β's *leta*: see Ferri ad loc. and my comm. on *Herc* 586 *clara . . . dies*.

Oct 747

Poppaea's Nurse argues that what we see in dreams reflects the concerns of the waking mind (740–42). How does she apply this principle to the fact that Poppaea in her dream saw mourning women in the royal bedchamber (718–20)? Ferri 1999 635–37 and ad loc. takes the gist of 746–47 to be, "there was actually mourning over Octavia's divorce in the royal residence yesterday," the implication being, "and consequently you saw mourners in your chamber in the dream." But since the *pulsata pectora* and *fusae comae* of 745 belong to the Latin mothers of the dream, it seems likely that the unexpressed subject of *planxerunt* in the next line is the same women, viz. those of the dream. This gives greater explanatory force to 746–47: it was Octavia's divorce they mourned, i.e. not any disaster threatening you; and they did so in the "residence of her father and brother" because that used to be Octavia's home by right of both birth and marriage. The implication is that Poppaea's waking mind was keenly aware of Octavia's divorce, and consequently in her dream she saw people mourning it.

The transmitted *inter* would be acceptable if it governed *penates et lares*, in the sense 'among the household gods.' But the fact that *larem* is singular shows that it is used primarily in the metonymic sense 'house;' consequently *penates* must have the same sense. Ferri is therefore right to accept the correction of *inter* to *intra*, found already in Avantius. For the corruption cf. 606f. *sacros intra* (β)/*inter* (δ)*penates*: in view of the similarity to the present phrase, *intra* must be right there too.

Ferri with the Lemairiana takes *fratris* to refer to Britannicus, but it must mean Nero (so Farnaby). Though Octavia and her Nurse

use *frater* of Britannicus frequently in the opening episode, thereafter 'Octavia's brother' designates Nero (535, 790, 893, 907), except in one usage by Nero himself (471). The play repeatedly emphasises that Octavia's status is by right of marriage to Nero and descent from Claudius (277f., 284f., 534f., 789f.).

Oct 761

Bücheler's conjecture *status* neatly cures the line, and is rightly adopted by Leo and Zw.[28] Poppaea fears that her dream portends some change: compare the parallel dream scene of Accius' *Brutus*, 2.7 R *populo commutationem rerum portendit fore*.

Recent critics (Courtney 1985 302, Delz 1989 62) have argued that A's *praesens metus* is defended by the phrase *praesenti metu* in 724. But in fact that phrase may be the source of A's error. Scribes sometimes accidentally substitute a word of similar shape from the surrounding context for the original word: for this source of error see above on *HO* 1240. Here the word *praesens* recalled *praesenti metu* to the scribe's mind, and so triggered the substitution.[29]

Oct 779

A has the line in the form *aut quid pectore portat anhelo*, which is unmetrical as the corpus contains no example in its anapaests of a dactyl in the second foot of a metron (Mantke 121). Editors since Leo have rightly printed the rearrangement *aut quid portat pectore anhelo* (Ascensius and later L. Müller). The fact that this rearrangement causes elision in the second metron is not an objection in *Oct*, since the frequency of second-metron elision there is much higher than in STrag (see Appendix §5.2).

Schmidt's proposal *aut pectore quid portat anhelo*, recorded as an alternative in the app. crit. of Leo and later editors, may be eliminated by reason of its awkward rhythm: there is no parallel in the anapaests of *Oct* for a metron beginning and ending with a monosyllable.

[28] Flinck 98 objects that *status* should be more precisely qualified: "nam ita semper est in his tragoediis posita vox *status*, ut cuius vel qualis sit status indicetur." Here, however, the meaning could be *status meus* and/or *status rerum*: the phrase is appropriately vague and euphemistic.

[29] The word *metus* similarly intrudes at 611 *mortis metu* from elsewhere in the play (106, 507). But if the original there was *memores mei* (Grotius), the mechanism of corruption was as envisaged above for 761.

(*Est* is enclitic 9, 371, 906, 968, and in 962 *quîs ius in nos* the preposition *in* is proclitic.)

Oct 780

I see no difficulty in A's reading *quicumque tectis miles exultat ducis*, though *exultat* has often been rejected. The palace guard are celebrating the emperor's new marriage (perhaps with soldierly excess), and so the messenger alerts them to the danger. For *exulto* of rejoicing over some event cf. *Phoen* 636, *Ag* 773. The word echoes the celebratory tone of the preceding choral lines (whether or not they were sung by soldiers at the palace, as Ferri suggests p. 342). Speakers at the beginning of a scene not infrequently pick up the content of the preceding ode (whether or not they have heard it) in their opening words, e.g. *Med* 116 *hymenaeus, Ag* 867 *annis decem, Thy* 623 *turbo praecipitem vehet*, 885 *aequalis astris, Oct* 899 *trahitis*.

If we alter *exultat* to *excubat* with Raphelengius, we must also reverse the order of *miles excubat* with Bothe, to avoid an iambic fifth foot. This seems extravagant. One might also object that if the soldiers were indeed "on the alert, on watch," they would not need warning of the danger.

Oct 789

The transmitted *divi* is clearly right: *divus* is used substantivally of Claudius at 534 (where the juxtaposed *Claudiae* clarifies the reference, as here), and adjectivally at 286 and 586. For the pairing "her father's house and her brother's bed" cf. 284f., 892f. The point is often made that the palace is Claudius' and so Octavia's by right (278, 285, 665, 747, 789, 803).

Ritter's conjecture *diri* is a dire example of paying attention to apparently parallel wording (227, 235, 661, 671) but not to context: Octavia and her supporters naturally describe Nero as *dirus*, but this message-boy dare not even repeat such insults (800), much less utter one of his own.

Oct 811

Laesi (A *lesi*) cannot stand. If the rebels are to pay with their blood (*sanguine vestro*), they will be killed, not hurt. *Laedo* is naturally used of hurt or offence inflicted *ultro*, not in requital. (Such hurt is more likely to *trigger* requital, *Oct* 414 [*terra*] *laesa quae fruges suas . . . condidit, HO* 414 *ut laesa es, dole.*) Bothe's *laeso*, "to the offended god," seems

a certain correction: for the verb used in this sense see the passages collected by Ferri ad loc.

Oct 827

The transmitted *et* is in order. First Nero speaks of punishing the rebellious plebs (820–26). Next his mind turns to Octavia, the cause of the rebellion: she *too* must be punished. After that (*mox* 831) Nero can chastise the people at leisure. The switch of focus from the plebs to Octavia and back to the plebs typifies the 'thinking aloud' character of monologues in Senecan style. Lines 825–26 respond to 820–24 and note the general desirability of "a punishment worse than death for the plebs," which is then spelled out in detail when Nero's thought returns to the plebs in 831–33. For initial *et* marking a new thought occurring to the speaker of a monologue cf. *Med* 135f. *et nullum scelus/irata feci, Oed* 954 *et flere satis est?, Thy* 196, 1075.[30]

Ferri ad loc. argues strongly for Bothe's *at*. He compares *Ag* 994ff., where Electra is to be punished with something worse than death, viz. immurement, *but* Cassandra (*at illa* 1001) is to pay with death. In the present passage, however, Nero's point about Octavia seems to be not so much *how* she will be punished, but rather that the uprising in her name allows him to punish her as he has long wanted. The focus is on a sequence of punishments (of plebs and Octavia) for the same offence, viz. lèse-majesté, rather than a contrast of different punishments for different offences, as in *Ag*.

Oct 834

Ingens (A) seems inapposite: Nero's point is the moral state of the plebs, not its numbers. Throughout *Oct* the plebs is described in qualitative terms (*favor* for Octavia, *furor, temeritas*), not quantitative. But the adjective is probably suggested by Sen. *Clem*. 1.1 *hanc immensam multitudinem discordem, seditiosam, impotentem, in perniciem alienam suamque pariter exultaturam si hoc iugum fregerit* (cf. *clementiam* 835, *iugo* 839): Nero is paradoxically thinking in Senecan terms.[31]

---

[30] Zwierlein's conjecture *en* is therefore unnecessary. In the corpus *en* is used with imperatives (*Tro* 507, *Pha* 54, 81, 412, 599, 945, 1273, *Oed* 975, *HO* 1233), but never with a jussive subjunctive. Ferri ad loc. argues in detail against *en*.

[31] *Ingens* might be taken as an adverbial accusative; so apparently Herrmann, "Elle se livre à des transports inouïs, cette plèbe." (For the usage with words of comparable meaning cf. *Phoen* 352 *immensum, Pha* 1007 *vastum*.) But *ingens* taken so

Oct 848–49

A's text could well be right. For a single verb (*compescis*) echoing a previous speech cf. *Oed* 938 *moreris, Thy* 473 *rogat*. Critics have often felt that Nero should echo the Prefect's word *compressum* more exactly: hence Bücheler's *compressus?* and Peiper's *compressit!* But Ferri explains the choice of word convincingly: *compescis*, "you *restrain* them?," deliberately and sarcastically belittles what the Prefect has done (a form of meiosis). It implies that the Prefect used virtually no violence, and indicates how far short his action falls of the revenge which Nero thinks due (*haec vindicta debetur mihi?*).[32]

Oct 858

Bücheler's *tua* for *qua* is accepted by editors since Leo. But even with this correction, there are multiple problems in the line *tua temperet nos ira, non noster timor*, "Your anger must govern us/me, not our/my fear." First it is unclear why the Prefect, who has just expressed disquiet in 856 over Nero's angry desire to punish the citizenry, should meekly fall in with the escalation of this desire to an extravagant new level in 857. Though restraint figures in STrag are overborne finally, they regularly put up a stout resistance first. And nowhere does a restraint figure explicitly accede to unrestrained *ira*; even Medea's Nurse urges control or concealment of anger (153, 381). Furthermore *temperare* basically means 'to moderate, restrain.' This meaning can be extended into 'to regulate, govern,' but such an extension seems highly improbable when the subject is *unrestrained* anger. Finally, *timor* must designate 'misgivings' felt by the Prefect[33] (speaking for himself or his troops as well); but his misgivings are clearly based on reluctance to massacre Roman citizens, not on fear. *Timor* in this context should mean fear of Nero (cf. *Thy* 334f., where the Satelles acknowledges *timor* for Atreus).

Frassinetti 1973 1115–16 and later Alenius and Kragelund (Kragelund 1988 494) punctuate the line as an indignant rhetorical question:

---

would add nothing useful to *exultat*; nor does the sentence flag the word as adverb rather than adjective.

[32] It is not uncommon for a *Stichwort* to echo an idea rather than a specific word, cf. 440f. *decet, iusto esse*, 441 *metu, timoris*, 459 *iussis, impera*, 863 *parere, fidem*, 866f. *valet, potuit*.

[33] So Ferri ad loc. Ferri takes *noster* to refer to the Prefect and *nos* to refer to Nero's subjects in general, but no such distinction is indicated by the Latin.

"is your anger to govern us, not our fear?" *Nos* and *noster* will now refer to all Nero's subjects, and *timor* will designate their duly respectful awe for the emperor. But this is not an obvious sense of *timor*, which should designate a sharper emotion, particularly in juxtaposition to *ira*. Furthermore one would expect Nero to point out that such 'respectful awe' has signally failed to prevent the citizens from rioting (so Ferri ad loc.).

I would therefore write *temperetur* for *temperet nos*: "There should be some moderation of your anger—though not of our fear." The passive *temperetur* will echo *temperari* in the same metrical position at *Herc* 404, where the subject is again *ira*. The line now indicates that harsh measures are to be expected from the emperor by Rome, but should not be dictated to him by anger. With this answer the dialogue developes in a more convincing fashion. When Nero angrily expresses a desire to punish the citizens (855), the Prefect remonstrates mildly against allowing *dolor* to determine policy (856); when Nero escalates his desire for punishment, the Prefect makes his resistance to anger explicit, but diplomatically does not reject the possibility of punishment (*noster timor*). Nero then indicates that his *ira* can begin, at least, to be 'moderated' by punishment of one woman (859). The Prefect accedes with alacrity (860) because this avoids a massacre, and resembles his own policy of executing only individuals (846).

If *temperetur* was written *temperet'*, corruption could have begun through loss of the compendium, followed by interpolation of *nos* to provide an object for *temperet*.

Oct 867–68

It is difficult to understand the syntax of the Prefect's speech in 876[b] *haud quemquam reor*. Zw. attempted to solve the problem by adding *mulier* from 868 to give *haud quemquam, reor,/mulier*, "A woman [could] not [stir up] anyone, I think." But Ferri shows that the parenthetical use of *reor, puto, credo* belongs to everyday speech and is not found anywhere in the corpus. Ferri himself explains 876[b] as involving ellipse of a dependent infinitive ("I don't think anyone [could have stirred them up]"); but such ellipse is again much too colloquial in style, as is shown by Ferri's own examples, drawn from Plautus and Cicero's letters.

The phrase is only tolerable, I think, if understood as interrupted by Nero and therefore incomplete: the Prefect was about to add *esse qui concitare potuerit* vel sim. The difficulty with this is that a person

interrupting another in STrag usually continues the syntax of the other speaker, completing it in a different sense, e.g. *Ag* 956 Clyt. *Quis esse credat virginem*—Electra *Natam tuam?*, cf. *Tro* 340, *Thy* 443. But Nero's *mulier* [sc. *potuit*] awkwardly goes back to the syntax of 867[a]. It is noteworthy that 868 would follow much more neatly after 866 *Quis regere dementes valet?* The dialogue would also have a clearer focus on the issue of women's (supposed) capacities without 867. I wonder, therefore, if 867 is the work of an inept 'collaborative' interpolator.

Oct 889

A's *sui* is well defended against Wilamowitz' *suae* (sc. *domus*) by Ferri 1996.

Oct 890

On the colometry *plura referre/prohibet praesens exempla dolor* see *SA* 37–38. The infinitive with its object constitutes a natural monometer *before* the dimeter, just as it does *after* the dimeter at 814f. *ille ferocem iussit Achillem/pulsare lyram*; the dimeter is marked by syntactical agreement between *praesens* at the middle and *dolor* at the end, cf. *ferocem* . . . *Achillem* (see *SA* p. 18, criterion III a[1]); and line-division after *referre* is confirmed by *syllaba debilis*. On initial monometers as justified by the principle of sense-correspondence see below, Appendix §3.1.

Oct 925–27

On the metrical deficiency of A's *firmum et stabile* (*brevis in longo* not preceded by the syllable carrying the word-stress) see *SA* 66. Richter's supplement *firmum et stabile<m vitae cursum>* cures this deficiency, and simultaneously provides an otherwise missing antecedent for *per quem*. For the phrase *dies volvit casus varios* cf. *Ag* 71f. *praecipites regum casus/Fortuna rotat*. The suggestion here is both of 'unrolling a series of events' (Austin on V. *Aen*. 1.9 *tot volvere casus*) and of instability.

Ferri following Zw. prints the following text: *nec sibi quicquam spondere potest/firmum et stabile/quem per casus volvit varios/semper nobis metuenda dies*.[34] This assumes two separate corruptions, of *quicquam* and *quem per*; it regards the metrical oddity of *stabile* as unrelated to either of these corruptions; and it introduces an awkward syntactical clash

[34] *Quicquam* (which Zw. spells *quidquam*) is a conjecture of recc.; transposition of *per quem* is a proposal of Herington 1977 277.

between the third-person <*ille*> *quem* and the first-person *nobis*. Richter's solution is far more elegant and satisfactory.

Oct 958

Many editors follow recc. in altering A's *mittet* to *mittit*, unnecessarily. For a future verb with *ecce* cf. *Herc* 1300f. *ecce iam facies scelus/volens sciensque*, and with *en* cf. *Oct* 342f. *en . . . ferar ad manes/inhumata tuos*. Here again some editors normalise to *feror* (Heinsius), which is however ruled out by *inhumata*.

Oct 967

A's text, which describes Claudius as *dignum tali morte et poena*, cannot be right. It is inconceivable that this author would make Octavia bitterly condemn her father, least of all in invoking him to witness, and in almost the last words she speaks.[35] The defect in sense is matched by a defect in metre: the rare SSSS is not a closing rhythm, and is not used before punctuation stronger than a comma anywhere in the anapaests of the corpus.[36] Consequently if a lacuna is the explanation of the problem, as seems likely, it is to be located *after* 967, not before.

Leo saw that 967 probably describes Nero (cf. 619f. *ultrix Erinys impio dignum parat/letum tyranno*).[37] His supplement <*perde tyrannum*> is rightly rejected by Courtney 1985 302 on the grounds that one calls on gods to witness a fact, not a prayer.[38] But the 'fact' in question cannot be represented by 968 *non invisa est mors ista mihi*, as in Courtney's proposal:[39] Octavia would hardly invoke Tartarus and

[35] The traditional 'explanation,' viz. that Claudius "deserved such death and suffering" because his follies had such disastrous consequences, goes back in essence at least to Trevet ("scilicet quia talem tyrannum tibi constituisti successorem"). Zw. rightly rejects it, but tentatively offers an alternative, viz. that Claudius was worthy of such a notable death as Octavia's, rather than an inglorious end through a dish of mushrooms. Both interpretations smack of desperation.

[36] The instances of SSSS in the corpus are *Pha* 33, 62, 70, *Oed* 436, *Oct* 12, 217, 974. My statements are based, of course, on the reformed colometry established in *SA*.

[37] The probability is strengthened by the parallel of Soph. *Ant.* 927–28, where Antigone wishes 'like suffering' on Creon: εἰ δ᾽ οἵδ᾽ ἁμαρτάνουσι, μὴ πλείω κακὰ/πάθοιεν ἢ καὶ δρῶσιν ἐκδίκως ἐμέ. There are several other similarities between the scenes in which Octavia and Sophocles' Antigone are dragged off to death, as noted by Ferri 1998 344–46. (One might add *Oct* 962–64 and Soph. 922 τί χρή με τὴν δύστηνον ἐς θεοὺς ἔτι/βλέπειν;)

[38] Cf. *Tro* 28–37, 644–47, *Med* 440f., *Oed* 13f., *Pha* 604f., *HO* 42–45, 1022–24.

[39] He supplements <*facibus saevis qui regem ipsum mox agitabis*> before 967. But the lacuna must be after 967, as I have noted.

the avenging Furies to witness that death is not unwelcome! More probably they are invoked to witness her unjust death, and to note its perpetrator for punishment. Perhaps, then, *dignum tali morte et poena* is part of the 'fact,' and insertion after it of e.g. <*esse tyrannum qui me extinxit*>[40] would give the gist of the original (for the phrasing cf. 25 *teque extinxit*, 174 *extinguat et me*, and for acc. and inf. after *testor* cf. *Tro* 644–47, *Pha* 605). For such an attestation cf. *Pha* 1208 *morte facili dignus haud sum* with my note ad loc.

This cannot, however, be the full extent of the lacuna, for 968 would be a non-sequitur immediately after a reference to Nero. This willingness to die on Octavia's part goes beyond her resignation to the inevitable in 960–62, and needs an explicit explanation: compare the similar passage at *Ag* 1004–11, where Cassandra goes willingly to death because Troy's fall has been recompensed by Agamemnon's murder; also Eur. *Hec*. 349ff., *IA* 1375ff. Probably, then, several lines have been lost. Earlier in the play Octavia twice said that death would be welcome as a means of escape from her troubles (102–13, 653–57). But it seems likely that the end of the play looked forward to Nero's fall, and that the gist of the missing line(s) was, "As long as Nero will receive due punishment for his misdeeds . . ."

Oct 969–70

It is artificial to punctuate after *ventisque* (Lipsius) so as to separate it in sense from 970 and attach it to 969. Such punctuation overrides the sense-pause suggested by the line-end of 969; in consecutive dimeters, *-que* attached to the first word heralds a new clause or phrase (4, 17, 25, 67, 69 etc.) far more often than it links a single noun to the preceding line (only 689 and 942 in *Oct*). Zw. accepts Lipsius' punctuation in order to bring the phrasing into line with the standard coupling of 'winds and sea,' and the standard expression *vela ventis dare* (*OLD* s.v. *velum* 2a). But *vela fretis dare* is perfectly acceptable in itself, as is shown by *Tro* 203 *pelago vela dares*, and *ventis petere* is equally unexceptionable, cf. V. *Aen*. 2.25 *nos abiisse rati et vento petiisse Mycenas*.

---

[40] This embodies elision and SS in the second metron, both of which features are much more common in *Oct* than in STrag (see respectively Appendix 5.2 and *SA* 93). Hiatus between dimeters is also much more common in the anapaests of *Oct* than STrag.

This page intentionally left blank

APPENDIX

THE COLOMETRY OF THE ANAPAESTS

Editors of the tragedies now agree that Sen. composed his anapaestic verses according to a principle of correspondence between units of sense and units of metre. They also concur that the colometry presented by the MSS is corrupt in many places, and that the principle of sense-correspondence can be used to restore the original colometry. But while some adopt the 'strong' version of this doctrine, viz. that sense-correspondence should be applied consistently, others take the 'weak' position that it should be modified by other considerations.[1]

My study of *Seneca's Anapaests*, published in 1987 (= *SA*), confirmed the strong version on the basis of characteristic metrical patterns. This appendix will present further confirmatory evidence based on the distribution of elisions. It will also identify flaws in the arguments used to support the weak position. It will conclude that the strong position is proven beyond any reasonable doubt, and may, indeed should, be adopted with confidence by editors.

1. *Introduction*[2]

The colometry of Sen.'s anapaests, as presented by the manuscripts, shows obvious signs of error. First, the two MSS traditions, E and A, diverge from each other at one or more passages in each of the seven genuine plays which contain anapaests. Second, when E and A agree in colometry, they exhibit not only some 40 instances of hiatus and *brevis in longo* at line-end, where these licences are permitted, but also 11 instances of these phenomena in the middle of dimeters, where they are illegitimate. This fact suggests, on a proportional

[1] I use these terms as they are used in science (e.g. the strong and weak anthropic principles) to denote the degree of validity accorded to a particular principle.

[2] This Introduction attempts to describe a complex situation in summary fashion. For detailed discussion and for documentation, the reader is referred to *SA*.

basis, that EA, even when in agreement, err in their colometry in at least 20% of anapaestic lines.[3]

In 1899 Gustav Richter showed that the basic principle followed by Sen. in composing the anapaests was one of *correspondence* between metrical units (dimeters and monometers) on the one hand, and units of sense, syntax and style on the other hand. The following lines illustrate the principle, with stylistic criteria highlighted:

pendet *summo* stridula *ramo*
pinnasque *novo* tradere *soli*
gestit *querulos* inter *nidos*
Thracia paelex,
*turba*que circa *confusa* sonat
murmure mixto testata diem. (*Herc* 146–51)

When the MSS colometry is adjusted so as to restore such correspondence, the adjustment also eliminates hiatus and *brevis in longo* in the middle of dimeters. Richter used this principle of sense-correspondence as the basis for correcting the MSS colometry in his Teubner edition of the tragedies, published in 1902.

The corrected colometry contains a much higher proportion of monometers to dimeters than is found in the MSS. Richter, for instance, prints nine monometers in the first ode of *Herc*, whereas E and A have two each. What has happened in the MSS, then, as Richter explained, is that scribes have tended (with varying degrees of consistency) to compress the original mixture of dimeters and monometers into a series of continuous dimeters, until they reached the end of an ode or section of an ode. At such an end-point, if the number of metra in a section was uneven, scribes were left with a single metron, which they would either write as a separate monometer, or tack on to an adjacent dimeter to form a trimeter.[4]

This recurrent phenomenon in the MSS of an orphan metron being left over at the end of a sequence is what misled Leo into his notion that Sen. used monometers with a clausulating effect, in the same way that he used adonii to close sections of odes in Sapphic metre (e.g. *Tro* 825, 835, 850). This idea is, alas, purely an illusion

[3] I say "at least," because it is likely that some of the instances of hiatus and *brevis* which EA present at the ends of dimeters should in fact occur at the ends of monometers.

[4] At *Herc* 146–51 (cited above), for instance, E writes continuous dimeters; the left-over metron *testata diem* is then tacked onto the beginning of line 152.

created by the vagaries of the scribes' colometry. It was discarded by Richter, and full restoration of sense-correspondence shows it to be baseless, since monometers are no more common at the ends of odes or sections of odes than elsewhere (*SA* 76f.). Unfortunately the notion of clausular monometers is one of those attractive myths which linger on after the basis for belief in them has collapsed.

For understandable reasons, Richter did not apply the new criterion of correspondence stringently in the Teubner of 1902. At *Herc* 1124–27, for example, he printed

non Argiva membra palaestra
flectere docti fortes caestu
fortesque manu, iam tamen ausi
telum Scythicis leve corytis . . .

where strict correspondence would require

non Argiva membra palaestra
flectere docti
fortes caestu fortesque manu,
iam tamen ausi
telum Scythicis leve corytis . . .

Even so, most twentieth-century editors were cautious about adopting so seemingly radical a re-ordering of the MSS colometry. However, Otto Zwierlein in his Oxford Classical Text, first published in 1986, rightly accepted the criterion of correspondence, printing a colometry similar to Richter's, though not identical with it. But Zw., like Richter, adopted modifications to correspondence, which will be discussed below.

I showed in *SA* that the metrical patterns of the anapaests reveal a marked differentiation between the first and the second metra of dimeters. The sequence spondee-spondee (SS), for example, occurs in one quarter of all first metra, but in only one-fortieth of second metra (respectively 26.1% and 2.4%); conversely the sequence dactyl-spondee (DS) occurs in one-seventh of all first metra, but in over half of all second metra (14.3% and 54.1%). When correspondence is disturbed, these metrical patterns are similarly disturbed; when correspondence is restored, these characteristic patterns are also restored. This metrical evidence establishes that Sen. regularly observed correspondence in composing his anapaests, not only in general but also in detail. As soon as a text diverges from sense-correspondence, it begins to generate unusual metrical patterns, which are clear warnings of error.

2. *The Evidence of Elisions*[5]

Joseph Mantke, in his study "De Senecae Tragici Anapaestis" (1957–58), noticed that elisions occur much more frequently in the first metra of dimeters than in the second (pp. 115–20). It was his use of Richter's Teubner text, with its reformed colometry, that enabled Mantke to perceive this phenomenon. At the same time, the fact that Richter had stopped short of systematically applying correspondence prevented Mantke from understanding how uneven the distribution of elisions actually is between the first and second metra. Statistics based on the colometry restored in *SA* show that elisions occur in the first metra of dimeters approximately *seven times more frequently* than in the second metra.[6] (The colometry of *SA* was based on correspondence and metrical patterns, without reference to elision, so there is no danger of circularity in these results.)

	First metron	Second metron
Elision within first foot	45	6
Elision at end of first foot	7	1
Total	52	7

[5] The formal method of presenting this evidence would be that followed in *SA*, viz. to study first those dimeters whose colometry is undisputed, next those which contravene sense-correspondence, and finally those where E and A disagree. I forbear from following that lengthy procedure here, first because this evidence is only corroborative; second, because the results are unequivocal; third, because the body of data is relatively small, so that anyone who wishes can easily follow the formal procedure from the material given here and in *SA*.

[6] I give references to facilitate verification and further study. The elision in each case involves the last syllable of the word given. Line-numbers, but not of course line-divisions, are those of the OCT.

Within first foot of first metron: *Herc* 1061 *tecum* 1065 *rectam* 1066 *tuque* 1068 *volucre* 1092 *pelle* 1131 *ite* 1135 *ite* 1137 *ite; Tro* 157 *secum* 712 *pone* 721 *ille; Med* 355 *cum* 795 *inque* 816 *una; Pha* 1 *ite* 67 *sive* 68 *sive* 70 *sive* 81 *signum* 339 *Venere* 960 *tuque*; *Oed* 172 *fama* 192 *iamque* 198 *solum* 740 *uno* 749 *illa* 993 *multi* 995 *atque; Ag* 62 *alia* 310 *canite* 316 *quaeque* 356 *tuque* 650 *quidve; Thy* 796 *nondum* 798 *nondum* 802 *te* 821 *ipse* 856 *iterum* 927 *magnum* 928 *stabilem* 929 *magnum* 933 *rectum* 935 *pelle* 937 *veterem* 938 *proprium.*

At end of first foot of first metron: *Med* 345 *nubesque* 816 *atque*; *Oed* 160 *rupere* 164 *atra*; *Ag* 63 *vexatque* 89 *ceditque* 370 *atque.*

Within first foot of second metron: *Tro* 137 *passa; Pha* 31 *mittite* 326 *Lydia* (followed by Grotius' *harenae*) 1147 *flebile; Oed* 196 *latice; Ag* 684 *pelago.* (I omit *Med* 343 *subito impulsu*, since on other grounds I consider it to be the first metron of a dime-

The above figures concern the first feet only, because elision does not occur in the second foot of either metron, or between metra. The sole exception is that aphaeresis (before *est* only) is occasionally found at the end of the second foot of either metron.[7]

These figures show that Sen. found elision acceptable in the first metron of the dimeter, but very largely avoided it in the second.[8] Such an uneven distribution of elision is found also in the small available amount of comparative material, viz. anapaests of the imperial period:[9] of eight elisions occuring in the dimeters of these poems, seven fall in the first metron, one in the second. The aesthetic considerations behind the avoidance of second-metron elision are not immediately evident, but other metres reveal a comparable discrimination about where elision is permitted or avoided.[10]

With regard to colometry, the essential point is that Sen.'s usage makes an extremely clear distinction between the first metron and the second. In this respect, the evidence of elision parallels that of metrical patterns, where there is an equally clear differentiation between the first and second metra, as noted in §1.

Consequently any modification of the principle of correspondence will begin to blur this distinction between the two metra in terms of elision, as of metre. For example, Zwierlein's text of 1986, though it admits only slight modifications to correspondence, nevertheless by doing so moves five elisions from the first metron to the second (*Herc* 1061, *Med* 345, *Pha* 81, *Oed* 172, 995), thus almost doubling the frequency of second-metron elisions. The necessary conclusion from the evidence of elision, as of metrical patterns, is that correspondence

ter whose second metron is lost, v. *SA* 65f. On Wilamowitz' conjecture *Solvite tantis animum, o superi* at *Herc* 1063 see my comm.: since it creates elision in the second metron, I am not inclined to retain it.)

At end of first foot of second metron: *Pha* 984 *atque.*

[7] First metron: *Tro* 100, *Med* 816, *Pha* 347, *Ag* 646. Second metron: *Ag* 102, *Thy* 953. The only aphaeresis in dimeters occurring elsewhere than at the end of a metron is *Thy* 883 *vitae est.*

[8] If my hypothesis about relative dating is accepted, we can speak of an *increasing* avoidance of elision in the second metron, since six of the seven instances occur in what I regard as the early plays (*Ag, Oed, Pha*).

[9] The poems are: Ausonius XI 21 Green (elision at 1, 10, 17, 19); Boethius *Cons. Phil.* ed. Moreschini 1 V (elision at 21), 3 II, 4 VI (elision at 10), 5 II, 5 III (elision at 18); Luxorius in *Anth. Lat.* Reise 299 (elision at 4), 322, 357. To keep the figures comparable with those for Sen., I have not counted aphaeresis.

[10] For the distribution of elision in Sen.'s iambic trimeters see *Proleg.* 203–29; for his Asclepiads see the study of Sadej 1951.

was observed systematically by Sen., and needs to be restored in a consistent and thorough-going way in his anapaests.[11]

At this point it will be useful to show, in a single table, how the criterion of correspondence affects three independent variables, viz. hiatus and *brevis in longo*, metrical rhythms, and elision. To give the clearest picture possible, I use only those passages where E and A agree on colometry, and compare the dimeters that do have correspondence with those that do not.[12]

	With Correspondence total dimeters: 301		*Without Correspondence* total dimeters: 128	
	first metron	*second metron*	*first metron*	*second metron*
hiatus & *brevis*	0	26	11	0
rhythms:				
DS	14.3%	51.5%	57.8%	18.8%
SS	23.9%	3.3%	1.6%	26.6%
elision	22	1	3	10

These figures leave no doubt that where correspondence is violated, the usual distribution of various metrical features is inverted.

3. *Alternative Criteria*

Several alternative criteria for colometry have been proposed, and since they would in most cases work against sense-correspondence, they call for discussion here. In particular, Zwierlein has explained the policies underlying his colometry in three places, at *Proleg.* 182–202 and at 1988 339–42 and 1990 692–96. It should be born in mind that Zw.'s colometry (first published in full in the OCT of 1986)

[11] In strict logic, what the data prove is that the distribution of elision is closely correlated with the structure of sense-units. Marcus Wilson acutely makes the parallel point with regard to metrical patterns (1990 193). So far as I can see, however, this observation would lead only to the null hypothesis discussed below in §4.

[12] The dimeters with correspondence are listed at *SA* pp. 9–10 fn. 3; those without correspondence, ibid. p. 12 fn. 5.

was developed well before the evidence of metrical patterns became available in my *SA* (1987). Consequently it was not open to him to use a combination of sense-correspondence with metrical patterns, which gives a more precise and detailed guide to colometry than sense-correspondence alone.

3.1 *Initial Monometers*

There is no disagreement between Zw. and myself in those many places where the criterion of sense-correspondence produces a sequence of dimeters, e.g. *Pha* 959–65. Debate begins when the sense does not fit into dimeters, and not least when a sense-unit occupies three metra, e.g. *Herc* 1054f. *Lugeat aether magnusque parens aetheris alti*. In *Proleg*. Zw. argued that such cola should be printed as unitary trimeters. But the evidence of both metrical patterns and pauses (hiatus and *brevis in longo*) is conclusively against trimeters, as I showed in *SA* 19–35. Zw. eschewed the use of trimeters in the OCT, printing only monometers and dimeters, and he abandoned the hypothesis of trimeters altogether at 1988 339.

How, then, should one divide those passages where the sense does not fall into consecutive dimeters? Zw.'s stated policy (1988 340) is not to allow an initial monometer. Thus he divides *Pha* 356f. *quid plura canam? vincit saevas/cura novercas*. The unfortunate effect of Zw.'s policy, in this and many other instances, is to violate sense-correspondence, the very principle on which his colometry is elsewhere based.[13] Clearly sense and style identify *vincit saevas cura novercas* as a unitary dimeter, comparable to many others in Zw.'s own colometry; this is confirmed by metre, since SSDS is far more common (13.6%) in Senecan dimeters than the SASS (1.3%) created by Zw.'s division.

The justification given for Zw.'s policy is that the MSS exhibit closing monometers but not opening ones.[14] But Richter's basic hypothesis (cited with approval by Zw. himself at *Proleg*. 183) is that

[13] Richter himself saw that the principle of sense-correspondence called for initial monometers in some cases, and he printed them correctly in his 1902 text e.g. at *Herc* 180 *volucrique die*, 197 *me mea tellus*, 1094 *vel sit potius*, 1106 *vastisque ferox*, 1120 *stipesque potens*.

[14] "Vielmehr ist in all diesen Fällen ein schließender Monometer anzusetzen, wie er in den Hss mehrfach überliefert ist," 1988 340.

the MSS colometry has been deeply corrupted, because scribes routinely merged monometers into sequences of continuous dimeters until they reached the end of an ode, or section of an ode. Initial monometers will have been the first to disappear as a result of this scribal practice. Zw.'s thinking (e.g. at 1988 340) is clearly influenced by the belief that monometers have a clausulating function, i.e. that they should close sequences but not open them. But clausulating monometers are, as we saw in §1, a mirage caused by the corrupt colometry of the MSS.

The unjustified ban against initial monometers is not, in any case, applied consistently by Zw. At *Med* 361 he prints (correctly) *aurea pellis/maiusque mari Medea malum*. Then why not *Lugeat aether/magnusque parens aetheris alti* at *Herc* 1054f., a closely similar passage? Similarly Zw. rightly sets off several initial monometers for rhetorical effect in the kommos of *Tro*, e.g. 79f. *Ite ad planctus,/miseramque leva, regina, manum*, cf. 102, 113, 130, 161. Logically, then, the same should be done elsewhere when a single initial metron is clearly marked off by sense and syntax, e.g. at *Med* 840, *Pha* 35, 37 *veniet tempus, cum latratu cava saxa sonent*, 81, *Thy* 942, 965, 968.

The remainder of Zw.'s discussion at 1988 340f. is based on particular passages, but the implied argument appears to be as follows: SS is indubitably found in the second metra of Senecan dimeters; therefore it is legitimate and correct to place SS in that position by a policy of using terminal monometers, e.g. by dividing *Pha* 1141ff. thus: *volat ambiguis mobilis alis/hora, nec ulli praestat velox/Fortuna fidem* (*praestat velox* = SS).[15] This argument will not stand scrutiny. Among the 301 dimeters whose colometry is unquestioned, being agreed by both MSS traditions and by modern editors, SS appears in the second metron only ten times (3.3%), usually after SA (7 times) and never after SS (see *SA* 9f.). By contrast, in the opening monody of *Pha* alone Zw.'s colometry creates six examples of second-metron SS (including two following SS) in 19 dimeters (31.6%), a clear indication of error.[16]

---

[15] Zw. claims at 1990 694f. that the figure for second-metron SS in my Table IXb (*SA* 28) represents a petitio principii. Not so: the dimeters in question are established by syntactical and stylistic criteria listed at pp. 16–18 and 24–25, not by metre.

[16] The 19 dimeters in question are those created by Zw.'s colometry and not by mine: 7, 9–10, 13–14, 31, 35–37, 39–40, 44, 52, 55, 78–79, 81–83.

3.2 *Variation*

Particularly in his review of *SA* (1990 693f.), Zw. invokes the criterion of variation. The specific kind of variation which he considers desirable is an occasional discrepancy between sense-units and metrical units. The absence of such discrepancies in my colometry leads to his colourful complaint that I have forced the anapaests into a corset of unprecedented soullessless.[17] But there is simply no evidence for variation *of this type*, unless one invokes the MSS where it is an accidental result of corrupt colometry. To assume *a priori* that there should be such variation is natural enough: it was my own initial working assumption, until the evidence against it became incontrovertible. Sen.'s anapaests do indeed exhibit a high degree of variation, but it is variation *of their own kind*. It consists particularly in the variety of rhythms, which is considerably greater than that of the dactylic hexameter, and in the interspersing, with varied frequency, of dimeters with monometers (*SA* 71f.). But to import another kind of variation on *a priori* grounds is unjustified.

The crucial fact is that the kind of variation which Zw. postulates would be *purely visual* in the case of Sen.'s anapaests. This is because inversion of sense-correspondence is accompanied by inversion of metrical patterns (as was shown in *SA*) and of the distribution of elision (as was shown above). For example, at *Pha* 81f. Zw. prints

> En, diva, fave! signum arguti
> misere canes: vocor in silvas.

But to an audience the sentence *signum arguti misere canes* will sound exactly like a typical unitary dimeter, in terms of sense, syntax (adjective-noun pair) and metre (SS and elision both occurring in the first half of the sense-unit, not the second). The ear will not be able to detect the supposed variation achieved by splitting the sentence between two lines. Since Sen.'s poetry, like most ancient poetry, is composed for the ear rather than the eye, a purely visual variation is ineffectual.

By contrast, the ear can easily detect conflict between sense and metre in iambic trimeters, where it is indeed a frequent feature of Sen.'s verse,[18] e.g. at *Thy* 1006–08:

---

[17] ". . . die Anapäste Senecas in ein Korsett zwingt, wie es seelenloser bisher nicht übergestülpt wurde."

[18] For details see Fitch 1981.

> Agnosco fratrem. sustines tantum nefas
> gestare, Tellus? non ad infernam Styga
> te nosque mergis . . .

Here metre combines with ictus to tell the audience that neither *sustines* nor *non ad* can be the start of a trimeter, though each starts a new sentence.[19]

Anapaests offered Sen. the possibility of two comparable kinds of variation which *could* be detected by the audience. One was to allow the sense-unit to overrun the line-end by a single word, and Sen. does indeed use that form of variation occasionally, e.g. *Oed* 164f. *Mors atra avidos oris hiatus/pandit et omnes explicat alas*. The other was to reverse the usual relationship between metrical patterns and sense-units, e.g. by using SS in the second half of a two-metron sense-unit rather than the first; Sen. employed that kind of variation very sparingly, and chiefly in what appear to be the early plays.[20] Variations such as these, however, are not what Zw. has in mind.

3.3 *Minor Criteria*

Zw. also relies, from one passage to another, on a variety of minor criteria. He is particularly interested in the positioning of words in anaphora. At *Med* 321–25 he places the third of four uses of *nunc* (323) in the second metron of a dimeter, with the purpose of providing variety of position, and the same consideration underlies his placement of *numquid* at *Thy* 810 (1988 341). But at *Med* 797–807 he uses the criterion of anaphora to decide that all six uses of *tibi* should sit in the *same* position in the dimeter (1990 695f.).

In the placing that *nunc* in the second metron at *Med* 323, rather than printing a monometer before it, Zw. is also influenced by the consideration that "das ganze Lied stark dimetrischen Charakter hat." But the fact that he has just printed two monometers in 316–19, where he could have offered continuous dimeters, shows that this criterion too is not consistently applied. Other criteria are less promis-

[19] Such conflict between units of sense and metre is also found (though with much less frequency than in trimeters) in the non-anapaestic metres of the odes, where again it can be detected by ear, e.g. in Sapphics at *Oed* 110–12. Discussion in *SA* 40 and 69–71.

[20] For lists and discussion of such metrical rarities, see *SA* 59–61.

ing still. At *Ag* 656ff., where he prints *Vidi, vidi senis in iugulo/telum Pyrrhi vix exiguo/sanguine tingui*, Zw. is impressed by the rhyme of *iugulo* and *exiguo* at consecutive line-ends (*Proleg.* 187), despite the fact that *exiguo* agrees with *sanguine*. (Compare the discussion of *Ag* 678ff. at 1990 695.) Clearly such details are straws in the wind. Observations of this kind may be valid within an colometry established on more objective grounds, but they give no firm guidance in establishing colometry.

The unsureness of such criteria is confirmed by the speed at which Zw.'s colometry changed in the 1980's. At *Proleg.* 190 and 196, for example, he listed eight "plausible" monometers; on the Corrigenda slip for that volume he abandoned seven of these without indicating a reason; in the OCT he abandoned the eighth (*Pha* 81) but revived one of the seven (*Ag* 357). Indeed, he admitted frankly that at times he relied on nothing more than personal taste (*Proleg.* 198). Perhaps such subjectivity was inevitable at that stage, but since 1987 the evidence of metrical patterns combined with sense-correspondence has provided an objective and reliable guide.

3.4 *Rhetorical Point*

Marcus Wilson, in a courteous and thoughtful review of *SA* (1990), suggests that one should "take into account the importance of rhetorical point, a prime characteristic of Sen.'s style and one especially relevant to the question of line arrangement" (192). This principle is exemplified in Wilson's discussion of *Herc* 125–27, where E has:

> Iam rara micant sidera prono
> languida mundo; nox victa vagos
> contrahit ignes luce renata,

whereas the criteria established in *SA* give:

> Iam rara micant
> sidera prono languida mundo;
> nox victa vagos contrahit ignes
> luce renata.

In favour of E's colometry,[21] Wilson writes: "Both *languida* and *contrahit* as the first words of their respective lines (according to the

[21] Wilson attributes it to "the manuscripts," but lines 124–161 are missing in A.

manuscripts) strike the reader because they are unexpected words which push in the direction of personification. They energise their lines." But we often find, in places where the colometry is secure, that new impetus is provided in the *second* metron of the line by the metrical pattern DS (*SA* 11), and this metrical impetus is often associated with energising words, e.g. in *Herc* 141 *ludit prato liber aperto*, where the adjectives in the second metron enliven the line. Similarly 168 *et congesto pauper in auro* and 185 *Stygias ultro quaerimus undas* contain "unexpected words," viz. *pauper* and *quaerimus*, each of which is located in the *second* metron. The aural effect given by metre (here DS in the second metron) is a more persuasive criterion for ancient poetry than the visual effect on "the reader" postulated by Wilson (cf. 3.3 above).

So we need not assume that line-breaks are the only, or even the chief, means of strengthening the point of a phrase in anapaests. (This is particularly true when a line-break falls between a dimeter and a monometer which are closely linked in sense.)[22] Indeed, since the position of line-breaks is the issue, there is a danger of circularity in using their position as an argument. The prudent approach, then, would be to examine those lines whose colometry is secure, in order to discover whether there are recurrent patterns of relationship between rhetorical point and colometry. If such patterns were found to exist, they could then be used as a supplementary guide to colometry. Such an investigation would, of course, be faced by the challenge of establishing reasonably objective criteria for the presence or absence of rhetorical point.

4. *The Necessary Conclusion*

Scholars of the ancient world are accustomed to dealing with hypotheses of greater or lesser probability. That Sen. consistently observed

[22] Wilson feels that to write *luce renata* (*Herc* 127) as a monometer places "excessive attention" on that "almost parenthetical phrase," by "setting it apart in a line of its own" (192); Zw. believes that to introduce monometers in *Med* 321–25 would break up the *Gedankenfluß* (1988 341). But these views seem to me to overstress the effect of the line-break in such instances: sense-units containing three metra must, after all, be divided at some point. Although the evidence is conclusively against trimeters, many sense-units covering three metra have a degree of metrical integrity

sense-correspondence in the composition of his anapaests, however, is no longer a hypothesis of that kind. Confirmed by three independent types of evidence—hiatus and *brevis in longo*, metrical patterns, and elision—it is an established fact.[23] On the basis of all these indicators it is now possible for editors to restore the original colometry with confidence in the great majority of anapaestic cola; indeed, such restoration is not only possible but essential. The remaining cola can be restored by the same criteria with varying degrees of probability, which can be objectively measured.[24]

In strict logic there is, of course, always an alternative hypothesis available. In this case the null hypothesis would be that Sen. occasionally inverted his usual practice of sense-correspondence, by starting sense-units in the middle of the dimeter rather than at the beginning, and (as a necessary concomitant) that he simultaneously inverted his usual metrical patterns and his usual positioning of elision. (The passages in question could not, of course, be identified today, since the apparent MSS evidence for them is invalid.) But the only conceivable motive for such a practice, namely variation, is untenable, since (as was established in 3.3) it would have been impossible for such variations to be detected by Sen.'s audience.

It took many centuries before Sen.'s original colometry was restored in general outline by Richter, and the best part of another century before Richter's views became generally accepted. One hopes that the next step forward, viz. acceptance of the reliable conclusions to be drawn from the evidence of metrical patterns, will be taken rather more briskly.

(*SA* 27–29), and it seems unlikely that their integrity of both sense and metre is seriously disrupted by the line-break.

[23] I should, however, correct an impression gained by Wilson and Zw. from *SA* that I have a personal devotion to the cause of restoring sense-correspondence. On the contrary, I began the research which led to *SA* simply in order to discover how to print the anapaests correctly in my *Herc* edition. My initial supposition was, indeed, that I would discover variation such as Zw. postulates, but the evidence as it accumulated pointed unmistakably in the opposite direction.

[24] The "remaining cola" are those whose division is discussed in Chapter 4 of *SA*.

5. *Further Details on Elision*

For the sake of completeness, I give the figures for elision in the monometers of STrag, and in the anapaests of ps.-Sen. and of *Apocol.*

1. The monometers of STrag (as identified on pp. 53–56 of *SA*) have 10 instances of elision within the first foot and three at the end of the first foot,[25] for a total of 13 in 283 monometers. This gives a frequency of one elision every 22 monometers, which is comparable with the frequency in the first metra of dimeters, viz. one in 16 (52 instances in 853 dimeters).
2. *HO* has 15 elisions in the first metra of dimeters and one in the second metra;[26] *Oct* has 15 elisions in the first metra and nine in the second.[27] The proportion of second-metron elisions is therefore far higher in *Oct* than in the Senecan tragedies or in *HO*. In other respects too the author of *Oct* is less scrupulous than Sen. or the *HO* author about avoiding certain metrical features, e.g. final SS in dimeters (*SA* 93). Similarly *Oct* has the only example in the whole corpus of elision (as opposed to aphaeresis) in the second foot of a metron (line 9), and has four instances of aphaeresis occurring *within* a metron (rather than at its end), in

---

[25] Within: *Herc* 1057 *tuque* 1132 *ite; Tro* 79 *ite; Ag* 98 *cum* 317 *quaeque* 354 *nescia* 382 *tuque; Thy* 866 *tecum* 881 *sive* 965 *nolo*. At end: *Herc* 1057 *ante; Med* 343 *atque; Ag* 382 *ante*.

Aphaeresis at end of monometer: *Herc* 1083, *Tro* 110, *Pha* 41, 353; elsewhere, *Ag* 648.

[26] Within first foot of first metron: 223 *atque* 612 *cumque* 639 *tantum* 1863 *flete* 1878 *arma* 1883 *flete* 1887 *magno* 1891 *flete* 1904 *flete* 1905 *vestrum* 1911 *nempe* 1917 *iamne* 1921 *teque*; at end 206 *volucremque* 638 *perdatque*. Within first foot of second metron: 671 *lampade*.

Aphaeresis at end of first metron: 604 (before *es*), 1214, 1215; elsewhere in metron: 643. At end of second metron: 631.

Monometers: elision within first foot 173 *ego* 1896 *flete*; aphaeresis at end 613, 651•.

[27] Within first foot of first metron: 6 *repete* 7 *atque* 8 *vince* 14 *utinam* 23 *illa* 25 *teque* 27 *ultra* 99 *temere* 336 *atque* 355 *voce* 893 *aulam* 921 *nemore*; at end: 22 *hostilem* 321 *ante* 650 *vobisque*. Within first foot of second metron: 7 *vince*, 12 *natae* 29 *ante* 84 *vince* 281 *Roma* 352 *ferre* 965 *scelerum* 973 *nube* 977 *templa*; a probable tenth instance is added by Ascensius' correction *pectore anhelo* at 779. On *Oct* 926 and 967, omitted from these lists, see *SA* 66f.

Aphaeresis at end of first metron: 963 (before *es*), 968; elsewhere in metron 201, 358 (before *es*), 946, 978. At end of second metron: 9, 297 (before *et*), 300, 944.

Monometers: elision within first foot 19 *tempore* 817 *regna* 915• *reddere* 921 *sola* 933 *nata* 961 *rapite*. No instances of elision elsewhere, nor of aphaeresis.

contrast to only two in the Senecan plays (*Ag* 648, *Thy* 883) and one in *HO* (643).

3. The anapaests of *Apocol.* 12 have suffered a process of consolidation in the MSS comparable to that seen in the tragedies: see *SA* 97–99. They contain three elisions. Once the original colometry is restored, we find that one of these occurs within the first foot of the second metron of a dimeter (20), and two within the first feet of monometers (17, 29).

This page intentionally left blank

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Editions

Bothe, F.H., *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Leipzig 1819, ²1834.

Farnaby, Thomas, *L. Annaei Senecae tragoediae cum notis*. Leiden 1613.

Fitch, John G. *Seneca, Tragedies*. 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library 62 and 78) 2002–04.

Giardina, I.C., *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. 2 vols., Bologna 1966.

Gronovius, J.F., *L. Annaei Senecae tragoediae passim restitutae*. Leiden 1661.

Gronovius, Jac., *L.A. Senecae tragoediae cum notis patris ex chirographo eius et variis aliorum*. Amsterdam 1682.

Herrmann, Léon, *Sénèque, Tragédies*. 2 vols, Paris (Budé) 1924–26. With French translation.

Kingery, H.M., *Three Tragedies of Seneca* [*Herc, Tro, Med*]. New York 1921.

Leo, Friedrich, *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Vol. 1, observationes criticas continens, 1878; vol. 2, Senecae tragoedias et Octaviam continens, 1879. Berlin (reprinted Berlin 1963).

Miller, Frank Justus, *Seneca, Tragedies*. 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library) 1917.

Pierrot, J., *L. Annaei Senecae Pars Tertia sive Opera Tragica*. 3 vols, Paris (editio Lemairiana) 1829–32 (vol. 1, containing *Herc, Thy, Phoen*, ed. by Pierrot).

Richter, Gustav (with Rudolf Peiper), *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Leipzig (Teubner) 1902.

Zwierlein, Otto, *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae; incertorum auctorum Hercules [Oetaeus], Octavia*. Oxford (OCT) 1986 (reprinted with corrections 1987, 1988, 1991, 1993).

Editions of single plays

Agamemnon

Tarrant, R.J. *Seneca, Agamemnon, Edited with a Commentary*. Cambridge 1976.

Hercules

Ageno, F. *L'Ercole furioso. Versione poetica e note di critica testuale*. Padua 1925.

Billerbeck, M. *Seneca, Hercules Furens: Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung & Kommentar*. Leiden, 1999.

Fitch, J.G. *Seneca's Hercules Furens: a Critical Text with Introduction and Commentary*. Ithaca and London, 1987.

Medea

Costa, C.D.N. *Seneca Medea, Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford 1973.

Hine, H.M. *Seneca Medea, with an Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Warminster 2000.

Oedipus

Häuptli, B.W. *Seneca Oedipus*. Frauenfeld 1983.
Sluiter, Th.H. *L. Annaei Senecae Oedipus, specimen editionis criticae*. Groningen 1941.
Töchterle, K. *Lucius Annaeus Seneca: Oedipus. Kommentar mit Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung*. Heidelberg 1994.

Phaedra

Boyle, A.J. *Seneca's Phaedra: Introduction, Text, Translation and Notes*. Liverpool 1987.
Coffey, M., and R. Mayer. *Seneca Phaedra*. Cambridge 1990 [referred to here as "Mayer" because the text was his responsibility, p. vii].
Grimal, P. *L. Annaei Senecae Phaedra*. Paris 1965.
Kunst, K. *Seneca, Phaedra. Text und Erläuterungen*. Vienna 1924.

Phoenissae

Frank, M. *Seneca's Phoenissae; Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden 1995.
Hirschberg, T. *Senecas Phoenissen: Einleitung und Kommentar*. Berlin 1989.

Thyestes

Tarrant, R.J. *Seneca's Thyestes, edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Atlanta 1985.

Troades

Boyle, A.J. *Seneca's Troades: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary*. Leeds 1994.
Fantham, E. *Seneca's Troades: a Literary Introduction with Text, Translation and Commentary*. Princeton 1982.
Keulen, A.J. *L. Annaeus Seneca, Troades: Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Leiden 2001.
Wertis, R.L. *L. Annaei Senecae Troades, edited with a Critical Commentary*. Diss. Columbia University 1970.

Octavia

Ballaira, G. *Seneca, Ottavia*. Torino 1974.
Ferri, R. *Pseudo-Seneca, Octavia, edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Cambridge 2004.
Ritter, F. *Octauia praetexta. Curiatio Materno uindicatam . . . edidit F.R.* Bonn 1843.
Whitman, L.Y. *Octavia. Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Bern-Stuttgart 1978.

Other Works

Anliker, K. 1960. *Prologe und Akteinteilung in Senecas Tragödien*. Bern.
Axelson, B. 1967. *Korruptelenkult: Studien zur Textkritik der unechten Seneca-Tragödie "Hercules Oetaeus."* Lund. (= *Korr.*)
—— See Zwierlein 1986 (*KK*).
Bentley, Richard. See Hedicke.
Billerbeck, M. 1987. "Textkritisches zu den Seneca-Tragödien," *Philologus* 131: 154–55.
—— 1988. *Senecas Tragödien: sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen. Mnemosyne* Supplement 105. Leiden. (= *SSU*)
Carlsson, G. 1926. *Die Überlieferung der Seneca-Tragödien: eine textkritische Untersuchung*. Lund.

—— 1929. "Zu Senecas Tragödien. Lesungen und Deutungen," *Bull. Soc. Reg. Lett.* 1928/9 (Lund) 39–72.
—— 1948. "Seneca's Tragedies: Notes and Interpretations," *C&M* 10: 39–59.
Coffey, M. 1957. "Seneca, Tragedies 1922–55," *Lustrum* 2: 113–86.
Courtney, E. 1970. [Review of Viansino's edition] *CR* 84: 198–200.
—— 1985. "Emendations in Seneca's Tragedies," *RFIC* 113: 297–302.
Damsté, P.H. 1918. "Ad Senecae Phaedram," *Mn.* II 46: 184–200.
—— 1919. "Ad Senecae Agamemnonem," *Mn.* II 47: 111–15.
Dehon, P. 1992. "Senecana," *AC* 61: 255–259.
Delz, J. 1989. "Textkritisches zu den Tragödien Senecas, dem Hercules Oetaeus und der Octavia," *MH* 46: 52–62.
—— 1989². [Review of Zwierlein 1984 and 1986] *Gnomon* 61: 501–507.
Fantham, E. 1998. [Review of Töchterle's edition of *Oedipus*] *Gnomon* 70: 676–79.
Ferri, R. 1996. "Ps.-Seneca, *Octavia* 889 and Vergil, *Aeneid* 12.539ff." *CQ* 46: 311–314.
—— 1998. "Octavia's heroines. Tac. *Ann.* 14.63–4 and the *Praetexta Octavia*," *HSCPh* 98: 339–56.
Fitch, J.G. 1974. *Character in Senecan Tragedy.* Diss. Cornell University.
—— 1981. "Sense-Pauses and Relative Dating in Seneca, Sophocles and Shakespeare," *AJP* 102: 289–307.
—— 1981². "Notes on Seneca's *Hercules Furens*," *TAPA* 111: 65–70.
—— 1985. "Seneca's *Troades* in a New Edition: a Review Article," *EMC* 29: 435–53.
—— 1986. "Seneca, *Troades* 197, 578, 585," *AJP* 107: 270–73.
—— 1987. *Seneca's Anapaests. Metre, Colometry, Text and Artistry in the Anapaests of Seneca's Tragedies.* American Classical Studies 17. Atlanta. (= *SA*)
—— 1989. "Zwierlein's Seneca and the Editor's Task," *CP* 84: 236–51.
—— 2000. "Playing Seneca?" in G.W.M. Harrison (ed.), *Seneca in Performance*, pp. 1–12. London.
—— 2002. "Transpositions and Emendations in Seneca's Tragedies," *Phoenix* 56: 296–314.
—— 2004. "Textual Notes on *Hercules Oetaeus* and on Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*," *CQ* 54: 240–54.
—— & S. McElduff. 2002. "Construction of the Self in Senecan Drama," *Mn.* IV 55: 18–40.
Flinck, E. 1919. "De Octauiae praetextae auctore," *Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemian Toimituksia*, sarja B, tom. 11, n. 12. Helsinki.
Frassinetti, P. 1973. "Problemi testuali nell' *Octavia*," *Rendiconti dell' Istituto lombardo. Lettere* 107: 1097–1118.
Friedrich, W.H. 1933. *Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik*, Diss. Borna-Leipzig.
—— 1954. "Sprache und Stil des Hercules Oetaeus," *Hermes* 82: 51–84.
Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth.* Baltimore & London.
Garrod, H.W. 1911. "Seneca Tragoedus Again," *CQ* 5: 209–19.
Hedicke, E. 1899. "Seneca Bentleianus," in *Studia Bentleiana.* Freienwalde.
Heinsius, N. 1742. *Adversariorum Libri IV.* Haarlem.
Helm, R. 1934. "Die Praetexta *Octavia*," *SBDA* philologisch-historische Klasse 16: 283–347.
Hendry, M. 1998. "Is Nothing Gentler than Wild Beasts? Seneca, *Phaedra* 558," *CQ* 48: 577–580.
—— 2000. "A Beastly Love Triangle? Seneca, *Agamemnon* 737–40," *CQ* 50: 317–20.
Herington, C.J. 1977. [Review of Ballaira's edition of *Oct*] *Gnomon* 49: 275–79.
Hillen, M. 1989. *Studien zur Dichtersprache Senecas.* Berlin & New York.
Housman, A.E. 1972. *Classical Papers.* Ed. J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear. 3 vols. Cambridge.
Hudson-Williams, A., 1989. "Notes on Some Passages in Seneca's Tragedies and the *Octavia*," *CQ* N.S. 39: 186–96.

—— 1991. "Notes on Some Passages in Seneca's Tragedies: II," *CQ* N.S. 41: 427–437.

Kapnukajas, C.K. 1930. *Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas in den Chorleidern des Hercules Furens und der Medea.* Diss. Leipzig.

Karsten, H.T. 1881. *Spicilegium criticum.* Leiden.

Ker, A. 1962. "Notes on some passages of the plays of Seneca," *CQ* 12: 48–51.

Kershaw, A. 1994. "*En* in the Senecan Dramatic Corpus," *HSPh* 96: 241–250.

Kragelund, P. 1988. "The Prefect's dilemma and the date of *Octavia*," *CQ* 38: 492–508.

Liebermann, W.-L. 1974. *Studien zu Senecas Tragödien.* Meisenheim.

Madvig, I.N. 1873. "Seneca Tragicus," in *Adversaria Critica* (2.109–27). Copenhagen.

Mantke, I. 1957–58. "De Senecae Tragici anapaestis," *Eos* 49: 101–122.

Martindale, C.A. 1977. "Notes on Seneca's Phaedra," *Latomus* 36: 501–04.

Mayer, R. 1990. "Doctus Seneca," *Mn.* IV 43: 395–407.

—— 1990². [Review of Fitch's edition of *Herc*] *CR* 40: 272–74.

—— 1991. "Notes on Seneca tragicus," *CQ* 41: 267–69.

Mazzoli, G. 1997. "Su alcuni loci tragici di Seneca," *Paideia* 52: 225–240.

Mueller, L. 1894. *De Re Metrica.* Leipzig.

Müller, M. 1898. *In Senecae tragoedias quaestiones criticae.* Diss. Berlin.

—— 1901. "Ad Senecae tragoedias," *Philologus* NF 14: 261–270.

Nisbet, R.G.M. 1990. "The Dating of Seneca's Tragedies, with Special Reference to *Thyestes*," *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 6: 95–114.

Pratt, N.T. 1963. "Major Systems of Figurative Language in Senecan Melodrama," *TAPA* 94: 199–234.

Richter, G. 1862. *De Seneca tragoediarum auctore.* Diss. Bonn.

—— 1894. *De corruptis quibusdam Senecae tragoediarum locis.* Jena.

—— 1899. *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Senecas Tragödien.* Progr. Jena.

Rossbach, O. 1888. *De Senecae philosophi librorum recensione et emendatione* (Breslauer philolog. Abhandlungen II 3). Breslau.

—— 1904. [Review of Richter's 1902 edition of the tragedies] *BPhW* 24: 326–33, 361–69.

Sadej, H. 1951. "De versu Ascepiadeo minore apud Romanos obvio," *Eos* 45: 109–136.

Schmidt, B. 1865. *Observationes Criticae in L. Annaei Senecae Tragoedias.* Jena.

Schröder, S. 2000. "Beiträge zur Kritik und Interpretation von Senecas *Oedipus*," *Hermes* 128: 64–90.

Siegmund, A. 1907. *Zur Texteskritik des Tragödie Octavia.* Leipzig and Vienna.

Smith, R.S. 2003. [Review of vol. 1 of Loeb edition] *BMCR* 2003.02.30.

Soubiran, J. 1966. *L'Élision dans la poésie latine.* Paris.

Stähli-Peter, M.M. 1974. *Die Arie des Hippolytus. Kommentar zu Eingangsmonodie in der Phaedra des Seneca.* Diss. Zurich.

Steidle, W. 1968. "Zur Erfindung von Senecas Troades," in *Studien zum antiken Drama.* Munich.

Stuart, C.E. 1911. "The Tragedies of Seneca. Notes and Emendations," *CQ* 5: 32–41.

Strzelecki, L. 1938. *De Senecae Trimetro Iambico.* Krakow.

Sutton, D.F. 1986. *Seneca on the Stage.* Leiden.

Syme, R. 1987. "Exotic Names, Notably in Seneca's Tragedies," *AClass* 30: 49–64 = *Roman Papers* VI (Oxford 1991) 269–86.

Tarrant, R.J. 1978. "Senecan Drama and its Antecedents," *HSCPh* 82: 213–63.

—— 1989. "The Reader as Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry," in J.N. Grant (ed.), *Editing Greek and Latin Texts.* Toronto: 121–162.

Timpanaro, S. 1981. "Un nuovo commento all'Hercules Furens di Seneca nel quadro della critica recente," *A&R* 26: 114–41.

—— 2000. "Su alcuni passi dell'Hercules Furens di Seneca," *Prometheus* 26: 143–58.
Traina, A. 1999. "Il dolore di Ecuba (Sen. Troad. 1062): alla ricerca di un'esegesi perduta," *Maia* 51: 411–413.
Wagenvoort, H. 1919. "Obiter tacta II: ad Senecae Phaedram," *Mn.* II 47: 363–67.
Walde, C. 1992. *Herculeus labor: Studien zum pseudo-senecanischen Hercules Oetaeus* (Studien zur klassischen Philologie No. 64). Frankfurt/Main.
Watt, W.S. 1989. "Notes on Seneca, *Tragedies*," *HSCP* 92: 329–47.
—— 1996. "Notes on Seneca's tragedies and the *Octavia*," *MH* 53: 248–255.
Williams, G. 1981. [Review of Tarrant's edition of *Ag*] *CP* 76: 75–82.
—— 1992. "Poet and Audience in Senecan Tragedy: *Phaedra* 358–430," in T. Woodman & J. Powell (edd.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, pp. 138–49. Cambridge.
Wilson, M. 1983. "The Tragic Mode of Seneca's Troades," in A.J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca Tragicus*, pp. 27–60. Berwick, Australia.
—— 1990. [Review of *SA*] *Phoenix* 44: 189–94.
Withof, I.H. 1749. *Praemetium Crucium Criticarum Praecipue ex Seneca Tragico*. Lyons.
Zwierlein, O. 1966. *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas. Mit einem kritisch-exegetischen Anhang*. Meisenheim/Glan. (= *Rez.*)
—— 1966[2]. [Review of Viansino's edition] *Gnomon* 38: 679–88.
—— 1969. "Kritisches und Exegetisches zu den Tragödien Senecas," *Philol.* 113: 254–67.
—— 1969[2]. [Review of Giardina's edition] *Gnomon* 41: 759–69.
—— 1970. [Review of Axelson, *Korruptelenkult*] *Gnomon* 42: 266–73.
—— 1976. "Interpolationen und Korruptelen in den Tragödien Senecas," *WJA* N.F. 2: 181–217.
—— 1977. "Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (I)," *WJA* 3: 149–77.
—— 1977[2]. [Review of Tarrant's edition of *Ag*] *Gnomon* 49: 565–74.
—— 1978. "Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (II)," *WJA* 4:143–60.
—— 1979. "Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (III)," *WJA* 5: 163–87.
—— 1980. "Weiteres zum Seneca Tragicus (IV)," *WJA* 6a: 181–95.
—— 1984. *Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe der Tragödien Senecas* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz). Wiesbaden. (= *Proleg.*)
—— 1986. *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz). Stuttgart. (= *KK*)
—— 1987. *Senecas Phaedra und ihre Vorbilder* (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz). Stuttgart. Addenda and corrigenda to OCT and *KK*, pp. 81–93.
—— 1987[2]. "Seneca, Medea 616–621," *Hermes* 115: 382–84.
—— 1988. [Review of Fitch's edition of *Herc*] *Gnomon* 60: 333–42.
—— 1990. [Review of *SA*] *Gnomon* 62: 692–96.
—— 1991. "Ein verkannter Ablativus Pretii in Sen. *Tro* 197," *Hermes* 119: 119–21.

This page intentionally left blank

INDEX OF LATIN WORDS

* indicates a cross-reference to a discussion published elsewhere.

ab 'by' *Tro* 45 fn.; 'from bottom to top' *Tro* 664.
ac and *et Tro* 1036, *Pha* 277, *Oct* 631.
accendo Phoen 112*.
acta HO 102.
Aegeus (adjective) *Pha* 900*.
aevum Oct 289.
affligor Herc 1317.
agito Pha 965.
alius 'different' *Thy* 51.
alternus of a succession *Thy* 835.
altus HO 380.
an . . . an Pha 259.
animosus Pha 1270.
animus 'anger' *HO* 31.
appareo 'be visible' *Ag* 458.
Arcticus Med 315.
arcus plural 'bow and arrows' *HO* 1648.
ardeo in HO 370.
arduus proleptic *Pha* 1043.
Argeus HO 318*.
artus plural 'body' *Tro* 1109.
aspergo Herc 20*.
aspero Pha 1103*.
ast ille/at ille at line-opening *HO* 510.
at Pha 239.
Atreus, scansion of first syllable *Tro* 341.
Atrides referring to Agamemnon or Menelaus *Ag* 273.
aucupo/-or HO 482.
aut: interchangeable with *nec HO* 1166; joining subjects of a negatived verb *Thy* 139; in questions *HO* 465; postponed *Herc* 454.

belua Thy 1033 fn.
bona ironic *Ag* 57.

carpo Herc 140.
carus little used by males *HO* 1452.
clepo, connotations of, *Herc* 799, *Med* 156.
coma HO 727*.
concipio Oed 97.
concutio Oed 97.
congero Tro 15.
corpus Phoen 159; confused with *pectus, Phoen* 159, *Oed* 1052*, *HO* 155.
cratis Oct 411.
cubile of the Sun's couch *HO* 1440.
cum and following verb forms *Phoen* 176*, *Pha* 648; with perfect *HO* 1907; postponed *Tro* 45 fn, 1044.
currus Pha 1069.

dammae Pha 62*.
decus Med 242; of persons *Tro* 878.
demens of prayers *Tro* 770.
dextra Med 248.
digiti priores 'forefingers' *Pha* 812.
dignus qui Thy 272.
dirus Tro 424.
disco in pointed use *Pha* 1199.
discors Med 773.
divido Tro 197.
divus of Claudius *Oct* 789.
dolet impersonal *Ag* 162.
domus for inhabitants *Thy* 3 fn.
dum Tro 997; with perfect *HO* 1907.
dura substantival *Tro* 424.

ecce Ag 5.
ecquando unpoetic *Thy* 58*.
eicio 'thrust out' *Pha* 1099.
ei mihi HO 1181, 1402*.
eius unpoetic *Thy* 299.
elido 'squeeze' *HO* 1240.
en: *Herc* 1028, *Med* 905, *Pha* 81, 788, 1022*, *Ag* 5; in messenger-speeches *Oed* 952; Kershaw on *Herc* 54 fn; with imperatives *Oct* 827 fn.
esse, see ellipse.
est auxiliary *Herc* 233; of the last remaining resource, etc. *Thy* 240; omitted *Herc* 1195, *Thy* 781.

et Pha 788; and *ac Tro* 1036; = *etiam Phoen* 137, *Oed* 1012; adversative *Med* 172, *Ag* 526; qualifying *Tro* 1160; inferential *Herc* 430; introducing a question *Herc* 430, *Thy* 58*; introducing new thought in monologue *Oct* 827; postponement of, *Herc* 233 with fn, *Phoen* 137, *Oed* 425, *Oct* 715.
etiam Tro 246, 279.
exulto of celebration *Oct* 780.

fallax with ablative *Ag* 57.
fax of light *Oct* 232.
felix Herc 743.
femineus in generalisation *Med* 267.
ferax with ablative *Pha* 326.
fero Med 844; see *feror, tuli.*
feror 'move' *Herc* 183.
ferrum 'chains' *Tro* 584.
flo 'blow along'? *Herc* 183.
frango HO 56.
frequento Tro 1011.
fremo of birdsong *Pha* 508.
fugitivus Med 115.

gemini Ag 837.
genitus as noun *Oct* 141.
gigno of mothers *HO* 1509.
gradus Oct 501.
greges for plural members of a *grex HO* 1850.

hac . . . qua Phoen 610*.
haud Pha 239, *HO* 1166; *haud/-t* corrupted to *aut Ag* 529.
Hercynius and *Hyrcanius Med* 713.

iaceo: of level land *Phoen* 603, *Pha* 10; with adjective or participle *Tro* 15f., 120, *Ag* 738*.
ibi Oed 762.
ignarus Herc 269, 296.
ignavus Herc 269.
ille HO 1527.
immensus 'countless' *HO* 915.
immitto Med 886.
immunis, constructions with *Pha* 1054.
impotens with word connoting power *Pha* 186 fn.
imprimis Med 617.
imputo HO 1303.
in or *in-* lost in MSS *Herc* 100.
incido with sexual connotation *Oed* 1051.
indo of chains *Tro* 584.
induo Herc 1028.
infestus Oct 232.
inflecto Pha 416 fn.
ingenium Med 910.
ingero Pha 1099.
innecto Pha 416.
invidiam facio 'arouse rancour' *HO* 1861.
ipse Med 345*.
iste 'this of mine' *Tro* 584.
istic HO 885.
iubar Oct 232.
iungo Thy 467.
ius Herc 43, 660.

laedo 'offend' *Oct* 811.
latebra singular and plural *Herc* 1012.
letum and *mors Tro* 783.
levis Pha 13.
litus = edge of sea *Tro* 837.
lux Oct 18.

Macetum (genitive) *Herc* 980.
macto Herc 634*.
maestus, constructions of, *Oed* 2.
male, translation of, *Ag* 496*.
malum as noun *Med* 19.
manus with reference to violence *Med* 181.
marceo Herc 980.
mater in pointed usage *Herc* 20.
-met HO 1245.
minae of a threatening assault *HO* 1182.
morae with verbs of breaking off *Tro* 1126.
mortalis 'mortal' *Herc* 362.
mox 'then' *Oct* 406.
munio Herc 94.

navis of substantial ships *Thy* 591*.
-ne in late plays *Thy* 58*, 316.
nec HO 182.
nefas of violation of cosmic order *HO* 1288 fn.
nemo Phoen 358*.
nempe Oct 195.
nescioquid Thy 267*.
nihil as adverb *Pha* 558* fn.
nocens of guilt by intention *HO* 899.
non contrastive *HO* 907.

nubilus (-*um*) *Oed* 45.
nudo Tro 74*.
nullus resumptive *Pha* 558*.
nunc = *iam HO* 56; *nunc nunc* with imperatives *Ag* 545 fn.

omnis with *ruo Oed* 702; 'completely' *Ag* 857, *HO* 1631.

paciscor Oct 141.
parare Med 843.
parens, loaded use *Ag* 970.
pareo 'be visible' *Ag* 457.
pario HO 274, 1509.
pariter coupling paired items *Ag* 755, *HO* 388*.
Parrhasis Ag 315*.
parum Med 293.
parvus of places *Med* 457.
patruus as adjective *Med* 457 fn.
pectus confused with *corpus* (q.v.)
perago Med 843.
Phlegethon = 'underworld' *Oed* 162.
Pisaeus Ag 938.
placet of decisions *HO* 1181.
poena 'suffering' *Pha* 439.
posco with inanimate subject *HO* 861.
potens corrupted to *parens Thy* 789.
praeses Med 248.
precor of ardent wish *Herc* 113.
premo of darkness, 'to cover' *HO* 488.
pro (interjection) *HO* 1201.
promo of dawn *HO* 1566.
puto Pha 218, *Ag* 795.

quantum as conjunction *Ag* 445.
-*que* introducing a question *Herc* 430, *Thy* 316a–21b; adding a third alternative *Pha* 71; after an initial negative *Pha* 97; in elaboration *HO* 1838; in anapaests *Oct* 969–70.
quidem emphasising adjective *HO* 1322.
quidve Oct 691.
quis postponed *Herc* 259.

reboo Tro 781.
reduco not excluding constraint *HO* 1203.
rego Ag 345.
remitto 'remit' *HO* 1001.
reor in parenthesis *Oct* 867.
repeto corrupted in A, *Oct* 48.
ripa 'stream' *Med* 742, *Oed* 468.
rumpo viam Thy 1008.
ruo linked with *omnis* or *totus Oed* 702.

sacer Phoen 277, *Oct* 156, 487.
sacrum substantival *Tro* 53, *Med* 680.
saepe modifying noun phrases *Oct* 501.
sepulcrum Tro 664*.
si + present subjunctive *Oed* 109; + present indicative re future, *Herc* comm. 1284; see subjunctive in conditions.
sidus Herc 553.
simul with *ac* and *et, Tro* 1036.
sinus Herc 679.
soleo in rhetorical exaggeration *Med* 1022 fn, *HO* 1767.
solum adverbial *Tro* 176*.
solus pointed *Med* 746.
sono of doors *HO* 254.
sorbeo of 'swallowing' ships and sea *Oct* 515.
sors Oct 388.
specus of hollows in body *HO* 1220*.
sto Tro 1147, *HO* 123.
Styx of underworld *Ag* 755.
summitto with parts of body *Ag* 738*.
superus as singular adjective *HO* 1124.
supplex 'in thanksgiving' *Ag* 394.
suus in paradox *Phoen* 23.

taceo connoting discretion *HO* 309.
tacitus Pha 636 fn, *HO* 309.
tempero Oct 858.
tendo (perfect stem) *Herc* 538.
texta/-um HO 564.
Theseus (adjective) *Pha* 831*.
tibi (quantity of final -*i*) *Pha* 964.
torreo 'roast' *Thy* 1018.
torus of Hercules *Pha* 328*, ?*HO* 1386.
totus: with *divido Tro* 959; *tota* (quantity of *a*) *Med* 928; 'completely' *Ag* 857.
trabs Pha 1224; of timber *Pha* 641.
trahere = *distrahere Tro* 664*.
tu: with imperative *Med* 817 fn; in prayers and hymns *Pha* 418, *Oed* 436*.
tuli of succeeding in crime *Oed* 287; with vague meaning, *HO* 1685.
tum/tunc Herc 778.

ubinam conveying impatience *Thy* 280.
ultimum (adverb), *ultimus HO* 1340.
unda Herc 683.

unus in pointed usage *Phoen* 444, *Med* 746.
urbes 'regions' *HO* 1562*.
ut: 'as if, like' *Pha* 367; introducing wishes *Oct* 448 fn; in sarcastic questions *Oct* 448; in elision *Ag* 496*; lost in MSS *Ag* 496*; with future participle *Tro* 1158.

vae *HO* 1402*.
vastus of sounds *HO* 1595*.
-ve in restatement *Ag* 603; corrupted to *-ne, Phoen* 162; corrupted to *-que, Thy* 688; after a negative *Thy* 688.
venio with dative, *Oct* 262.
verso *Pha* 521.
victor of Apollo *Ag* 322.
video *Med* 171, *Pha* 216.
viscera *Med* 39.
vivax *Herc* 743.
vivus *HO* 373.
vulnus *Thy* 10.
vultus *HO* 1708.

GENERAL INDEX

* indicates a cross-reference to a discussion published elsewhere. → indicates that further references will be found in the index of my *Hercules* edition.

A (hyparchetype), normalisation in, *Pha* 123; see interpolation.
accusative: of respect *Tro* 296 fn, *Oed* 2, *HO* 727*; adverbial acc. of adjectives *Thy* 267*, *HO* 1595*.
address, formal *Phoen* 320.
addressee not identified *Herc* 1122, *Med* 817.
adjectives: reflecting speaker's attitude *Med* 457; from names in *-eus Pha* 900*; in *-fer* and *-ger Pha* 909.
aeolics *Pha* 1140.
'ages of mankind' myth *Oct* 156, 406.
Ajax, Locrian *Tro* 45; Telamonian and, *Tro* 844, *Ag* 210.
allusion, intertextual *Pha* 1152; see also imitation.
allusive references to mythical figures *Herc* 778, *Tro* 45, *Thy* 58*.
anachronism *Tro* 578.→
anapaests, *brevis in longo* in, *Oct* 925; colometry *Oct* 890; metre *Herc* 1063, *Ag* 59, *Oct* 779, 967; elision *Herc* 1063, *Pha* 326, 618, *Oct* 9, 779; hiatus *Oct* 26; word-order *Ag* 358. See Appendix *passim*.
anaphora *Tro* 74*, *Med* 73; of verbs *Phoen* 176*; see repetition.
Apollo *Ag* 322, 332.
apposition *Herc* 553, *HO* 1041.
Argos *Phoen* 374*.
argument, tendentious *Tro* 246, 337, *Ag* 195.
assimilation: of case *Tro* 1149, *Med* 248, *HO* 1789, *Oct* 715; of gender *Herc* 454, *HO* 1340; of mood *Phoen* 358*; of tense *Tro* 352, *Phoen* 85, *Pha* 452; see attraction.
asyndeton *Herc* 299*, *Tro* 578, *Ag* 810*, *HO* 1648, *Oct* 411; between two items, *HO* 1342, *Oct* 261 with fn.
attraction by gender *HO* 986, 1762; of antecedent *Phoen* 374.*
attribution error, see speaker attributions.

birdsong, words for, *Pha* 508.

cataclysm *Oct* 391.→
change of grammatical subject unannounced *Oed* 619, *HO* 844.
characterisation by language *Ag* 404, 414, *Thy* 280.
choral odes: ellipse in, *Oed* 436*; endings *Oed* 762; reciprocity *Pha* 1123; word-order *Herc* 233; echoed at start of following Acts *Oct* 780; bridge passages into Acts *Oed* 202; function of Chorus in dialogue *HO* 1831.→
codex optimus, doctrine of, see E.
colometry, see anapaests.
comparisons, implicit, *Pha* 764*; between pairs of people *Ag* 210.
compendia as source of corruption, *Oct* 858.
confusion of syllables *dis-/de- Med* 715; of words: *aeternus/alternus Thy* 835; *factum/fatum HO* 1562*; *favor/furor*, *Oct* 577; *inter/intra*, *Oct* 747; *non/nunc*, *Oct* 522 fn; *parat-/peract- Med* 843; *victus/vinctus Phoen* 571. See also corruption.
'correction' by scribes *Thy* 290, *HO* 373, 1038; in E *HO* 1218.
corruption of letters: *e/i Tro* 304; *e/a Phoen* 358*; *u/n Herc* 108.
Of words: *-ne* and *-ve* to *-que Tro* 504, *Thy* 688; *-ve* to *-ne Phoen* 162; *iacere* to *patere Phoen* 603; *haud/-t* to *aut Ag* 529f.; *hinc* to *hic Pha* 508–10 fn; *man-* to *min- Med* 181; *potens* to *parens Thy* 789; *Parrhas-* to *Parnas- Ag* 315*.
Of person of verb *Herc* 259.
See proper names; error in MSS.

cosmos, regions of, as compositional principle *Ag* 546, *Oct* 411, 515.
cryptic initial statement *Tro* 197, *Thy* 1008
Cupid *Pha* 186, 275.

dactylic hexameter, closure of final open syllable in, *Oed* 404 fn.
deliberative question *Med* 53.
disjunctiveness *Herc* 130, *Oed* 468→; see pleonasm.
dramatic technique *Oed* 202.

E (Etruscus), excessive respect for, *Tro* 1031, *Phoen* 651, *Med* 345*, *Thy* 290, *HO* 1092, 1322, 1562. See interpolation.
'east and west' = 'everywhere' *HO* 1838.
elision *Herc* 634*, *Tro* 45f. fn, *Phoen* 320, *Pha* 618, 1103*, *Ag* 795 and fn, *HO* 488 fn; in Asclepiads *Pha* 764*; see anapaests.
ellipse *Phoen* 356, *HO* 465, *Oct* 867; of *esse* *Herc* 1195 fn, *Tro* 1044, *Phoen* 134, *Oed* 538; in lyric *Oed* 436–44*; elliptical thought *Tro* 922, *Oct* 354.→
error in MSS, types and sources of: see compendia, confusion, corruption, glosses, haplography, interpolation, intrusion, normalisation, omission, paleography, *saut des yeux*, self-reference, speaker attributions, transposition.
etymological play *Herc* 799, *Tro* 844 fn, *Med* 910 with fn, *Pha* 1106*, *Oed* 216, *Ag* 388, *HO* 1651.
exit, motivation for, *Pha* 404.

foreshadowing *Herc* 20.

generality and detail, *HO* 461, 640.
geography as a text criterion *Pha* 23, *Oed* 283.
glosses, *Tro* 341; intrusive *Herc* 1023, *Med* 315, *Pha* 521, 831*, 1178, *Ag* 273, 315*, 739, *Thy* 58*, 1052, 1074*, *HO* 373, 1079*, 1245–46, 1506*, *Oct* 696; in E, *HO* 854.→
guilt *HO* 899.
haplography *Pha* 1099, *Oed* 832, *HO* 1500 fn.
Hecate *Med* 680, 817, 842.
Hercules' conception, phrases for, *HO* 1500.
hiatus, see anapaests, iambic trimeter; before *o*, *HO* 1201.
HO borrowing from STrag, see imitation.
homoeoteleuton *Herc* 20*, *Oed* 69.
hymn and prayer style *Tro* 878, *Pha* 418, *Ag* 322, 810*; wedding hymns *Med* 98.
hyperbaton *Oct* 715; with prepositions *HO* 1625.→
iambic trimeter, first foot *HO* 510 fn; second foot *Med* 267; third *Herc* 904, *HO* 739; fifth *HO* 20*, *Tro* 1080, *HO* 844, *Oct* 173; spondees in second and fourth feet? *Ag* 934; hiatus in? *HO* 1402*, *Oct* 515.→
imitation of earlier writers as criterion for text criticism: of Euripides, *Herc* 146, *Tro* 1109, *Phoen* 651, *Pha* 1022*; of Homer, *Tro* 820*, 844; of Ovid, *Tro* 176*, 180, *Med* 680, *Pha* 328*, 596, 899, 1016*, 1224, *Oed* 502, *Ag* 163, *Thy* 41, *HO* 271*, 388, 564, 1833, *Oct* 406, 415; of Propertius, *Ag* 322; of Sen. in ps.-Sen., *Pha* 261* fn, *HO* 274, 428, 435, 482, 543, 640, 680*, 739, 923, 949, 1245, 1483, 1653, 1716*, 1789, *Oct* 26, 141, 458, 487, 834; of Sophocles, *HO* 841, *Oct* 967 fn; of Vergil, *Herc* 690 fn, 778, *Tro* 45, *Ag* 777.
imitation by later writers as a criterion, *Herc* 380, 742, 1063, *Tro* 197, *Med* 715.
imperatives: in *-to* *Tro* 1019; in prohibitions *Pha* 758; with *en* *Oct* 827 fn; with *tu* *Med* 817 fn.
inconsonance *Herc* 94, *Tro* 273, *Oed* 548, 551.
indicative in conditions *Pha* 123; in indirect questions *Ag* 414, *Thy* 771.
Ino in myth *Phoen* 23.
interpolation *Tro* 994, *Med* 242, 477, *Pha* 377, *Oed* 636.→
  antiquity of, *Med* 666.
  collaborative *Herc* 83, 336, *Phoen* 447, *Med* 768*, *Pha* 62*, 1043, 1106*, *Ag* 479, *Thy* 299, *HO* 640, *Oct* 867.

corrective *Phoen* 196, *Pha* 783, *Thy* 771, *HO* 1092, 1459*.
displaying learning *Herc* 83 fn, *Pha* 1106*.
explanatory/clarifying *Herc* 130, *Tro* 1147, *Phoen* 448, *Med* 666, *Pha* 1106*, *Ag* 479, *Thy* 388.
normalising *Ag* 414, *Thy* 771, *Oct* 173.
of proper name *Thy* 58; including proper name *Herc* 130, *Tro* 341, 1147, *Med* 666, *Pha* 1106*, *Thy* 299.
of synonyms *Herc* 799.
in A, *Herc* 799, *Tro* 787, *Phoen* 388, *Oed* 45, 832, *Ag* 300, 414, 545, *Thy* 467, 771, *HO* 246, 318*, 461, 680*, 814, 885, 997, 1079, 1648, 1767, *Oct* 48, 49, 173, 261, 458.→
in E, *Herc* 1063, *Pha* 783, *Ag* 517, *HO* 246, 1038, 1166, 1459*, 1648.→
interruption by another speaker *Oct* 195, 867.
interweaving of noun-adjective phrases *Herc* 94, 336 fn, *Phoen* 46, *Pha* 2.→
intrusion of second-person verb *Herc* 259; of sententiae, *Ag* 934; of words and phrases from other lines, *HO* 1220, 1240 fn, 1625, 1636, *Oct* 515, 611, 761. See glosses.
inversion of word-order *Ag* 865; in comparisons *Phoen* 79.
irony *Ag* 725.
Isthmus identified with territory of Argos *Herc* 336, *Phoen* 374*.

juxtaposition: contrastive *Phoen* 137, *Thy* 591*; conveying implication *Pha* 1207; of adjectives of similar meaning *Thy* 736; of terms of relationship *Phoen* 134.→
lacunae, see omission.
link-words in dialogue *Oct* 848.
literal vs rhetorical criteria, see text criticism.
meiosis *Med* 457, *Oct* 848.
metre, see aeolics, anapaests, dactylic hexameter, elision, hiatus, iambic trimeter, sapphics.
misreading of letters, see corruption.
monologues, structure of, *Oct* 827.
multivalent language *Phoen* 259, *Med* 39, 773, 910 with fn, 1022, *Pha* 420, 971, *Oed* 908, *Ag* 33, *Thy* 3, 58*, *HO* 1743.
names, see proper names.
narrative style *Tro* 176* fn, 197, *Pha* 1022*, *HO* 1648.→
Nomia, Mt, *HO* 1885*.
normalisation *Herc* 1012, 1237, *Tro* 1160, *Pha* 123, *Ag* 414, 725, *HO* 1648.
number, 'corrected' by E, *HO* 1038.
numbers, play on, *Phoen* 444, *Ag* 837, *HO* 183*.→
Olenos *Oed* 283–85.
omission: of *n Ag* 810*; of *in/in- Herc* 100; of word(s) *Oed* 1012, *Ag* 545; of *est Herc* 1195, *Thy* 781; of line(s) *Herc* 778, *Tro* 994, *Med* 98, *Pha* 508, *Oed* 69, *HO* 844, 1166, 1716*, *Oct* 174*; starting in mid-trimeter *HO* 739, 1402* fn; in anapaests *Med* 343*, *Pha* 328*, 1145*, *Oed* 162*, 174*, 179*, *Oct* 967.
Ovid, see imitation.
Oxford Latin Dictionary, passim; additional definitions required, *Med* 742, *Pha* 439, *Ag* 394; corrigenda to, *Herc* 1028, *Tro* 1011.

paleography vis-a-vis other causes of corruption *Pha* 755, *Ag* 315*, *HO* 373 fn, 1008 fn, 1794.
papyrus fragment of Medea *Med* 666, 680.
paradox *Phoen* 23, 236, 259, *Med* 172, 320, 413, *Ag* 837, *HO* 1092* fn, 1245, *Oct* 18, 49.→
parallelism of phrasing *HO* 814.→
parallels, use of in text criticism, *Tro* 53 fn, *Pha* 367, *HO* 309, 899, *Oct* 789.
parataxis *Thy* 272, 309.
parenthesis *Tro* 787f., 994; of *reor* etc. *Oct* 867–68; parenthetic commands *Oct* 553.
participial phrases, coordinate *Tro* 1044.
participle as substantive *Herc* 660, *Phoen* 320; ablative singular in *i/e Herc* 904; future *Tro* 922, 1158, *HO* 1622.→
perfect of instantaneous result *Pha* 1022–25* fn, *Thy* 591*.

persons referred to allusively *Herc* 778, *Tro* 45, *Thy* 58*; → allusiveness.
Phaethon *Pha* 1092, *HO* 680* fn.
Philoctetes *HO* 1595*, 1653, 1831.
pleonasm *Herc* 362, *Pha* 641*, 1204; of clauses *Herc* 321, 634*, 742, *Tro* 197, *Pha* 618; of adjectives *Thy* 736, *HO* 1789. See disjunctiveness.
pluperfect tense *Herc* 538, *Tro* 1098, *Pha* 648, *Oct* 294.
plural, generalising *Tro* 1002f.
plural verb after singular subjects *Oed* 69.
point, rhetorical *Herc* 20, *Tro* 844, 1002, *Phoen* 23, 85, 196, 456, *Med* 293, 746, *Oed* 1012, *Ag* 210, 725, *Thy* 240, 272, 275, *HO* 543, 1245, *Oct* 49, 141.
polar expression *Herc* 83, *Phoen* 610*, *Med* 760.
postponement of words *Herc* 259 (*quis*), *Tro* 1044 (*cum*); in *Oct*, 26, 715.→
prayers *Med* 680; silent *Pha* 636; see hymns.
prohibitions *Pha* 758.
proper names: corrupted *Med* 713, *Pha* 900*, *Oed* 283, *Ag* 315*, 566; etymological play on, *Med* 910, *Pha* 1106*; in *-eus* *Tro* 341; in self-reference *Phoen* 552; interpolated, see interpolation; pointed use, *Tro* 844.→
prosaic diction, see 'unpoetic.'
Publilius Syrus, *Ag* 934.
punctuation, artificial use of, *Herc* 1195, *Tro* 994, *Med* 19 fn, 267 fn, *Pha* 275, *Oed* 619, *Oct* 48, 969.

questions: alternative *Pha* 259f.; deliberative *Med* 53; forms of, *Ag* 404 and fn; indirect *Ag* 414, *Thy* 771; and direct *Oed* 274.

repetition of words *Herc* 251, 634*, *Tro* 74, *HO* 1671, *Oct* 232 fn; see anaphora.→
revelation of inner thoughts *Ag* 404, 414.
rhetoric, see argument, meiosis, paradox, point, text criticism, word-play; rhetorical organisation *Thy* 41*, *Oct* 294.

sapphics, adonii in, *Tro* 844.
saut des yeux as cause of error *Oct* 411.
scene change within an Act, *Pha* 404.
self-address, shift of person in, *Herc* 1028, *HO* 1777.
self-correction *Pha* 115.→
self-description *Tro* 965*, *Oed* 952, *Ag* 517.
self-reference in third person, *Phoen* 552; puzzling to scribes *Pha* 1178, 1199 with fn, *HO* 1777.
sense-pauses, position in line, *Tro* 1031, *Oed* 649, *Oct* 969.→
simile *Herc* 1089, *Med* 98; and apodosis *Pha* 641, *Ag* 898; multiple *Pha* 764*.
singular for plural *Herc* 683, *Tro* 1031, *Pha* 1224, *Oed* 10, 532, *Ag* 315*, *HO* 1708.
speaker-attributions *Tro* 965*, *Phoen* 651, 663, *Pha* 404, 1199f. with fn, *Thy* 309, 316.→
stage direction in text *Med* 553, 1020.
staging *Herc* 1122, 1312, *Med* 676, 680 fn, *Oed* 300, *HO* 1386.→ See also exit, scene change, stage direction.
Stichwörten, see link-words.
subjunctive: dismissive jussive *Oed* 832; hypothetical *Oed* 648; in conditions *Herc* 960, *Pha* 123, *Oed* 109 (→ conditions); in generalising second-singular verbs *Thy* 1052; in inference, *Herc* 526; of characteristic *Tro* 1021; potential *Tro* 279; with *dum* *Tro* 997; coupled with indicative *Pha* 648, *Ag* 414.
syncopated perfect forms *Herc* 960, *Pha* 648.
synizesis *Tro* 341, *Thy* 1052.

Tacitus *Annals* 12, *Oct* 141.
tenses *Tro* 352, *Med* 677, *Pha* 452, *HO* 940; in narrative *Tro* 176 fn, 1098; future *HO* 940, *Oct* 958; deliberative *Med* 53; with *dum* *Tro* 997; see also perfect, pluperfect.
terseness: characterising *Thy* 280; in narrative *HO* 1648.
text criticism, criteria for: literal vs rhetorical *Herc* 1028, *Tro* 246, 337, 922, 1168, *Med* 293, 457, *Pha* 618, 1179, *Oed* 66, *Ag* 195, 898; Ockham's razor *Tro* 1031 and fn,

Med 19, 516, *Oed* 832, *Thy* 290, *HO* 640, *Oct* 925; see error in MSS, imitation, paleography, parallels.
'thinking aloud' in monologues *Phoen* 243, *Med* 923, *HO* 64, *Oct* 827.→
transference of action *Med* 367, *Pha* 88.
transposition of lines *Herc* 49, 146*, *Tro* 820*, 965*, *Pha* 261*, 764*, 1016*, 1022*, *Oed* 436*, *Ag* 471, *Thy* 41*, 290, 299, 591*, *HO* 87*, 271*, 640, 1081, 1716*; of words *Tro* 1044.

underworld *Herc* 49, 94, 660, *Tro* 197, *Oed* 560, *Ag* 759, *HO* 1081.→
'unpoetic' diction *Med* 115, 617, *Pha* 218, *Thy* 299.→

variatio in phrasing *Pha* 71, 1204, *Ag* 264.→
vocabulary, unspecific *Pha* 1048.
vocative: in formal address *Phoen* 320; marking new interlocutor *HO* 884; and nominative *Herc* 259, *Oed* 404.

wedding hymns *Med* 98.
women, stereotypes of, *Med* 267 fn; association with mourning *HO* 183*.
word order: see hyperbaton, interweaving, inversion, postponement.
word-play: on unrelated words *Oct* 132; see etymological play, numbers.→